

The Hope for the Restoration of the Davidic Kingdom  
in the Light of the Davidic Covenant in Chronicles

Sunwoo Hwang

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Edinburgh

2011

I dedicate this thesis to my sister  
Sunah Hwang,  
who went to the presence of God in the midst of my writing this thesis.

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	vi
Abbreviations	vii
I. Introduction	1
1. A Problem	1
2. Review of Previous Scholarship	6
2. 1. Nathan's oracle	6
2. 2. Solomon's prayer	10
2. 3. Abijah's speech	11
2. 4. Other disputed passages	12
2. 5. Terminology	15
3. Methodology	16
II. The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chr 17:1-27	19
1. Setting	19
2. Synoptic Comparison	19
2. 1. 2 Sam 7:6//1 Chr 17:5	19
2. 2. 2 Sam 7:12//1 Chr 17:11	27
2. 3. 2 Sam 7:14-15//1 Chr 17:13	34
2. 4. 2 Sam 7:16//1 Chr 17:14	43
2. 5. 2 Sam 7:20//1 Chr 17:18	54
3. Further Issues	55
3. 1. Ideology for the revival of the Davidic dynasty	55
3. 1. 1. עולם	55
3. 1. 2. The Davidic kingdom as YHWH's kingdom	62
3. 1. 3. The Davidic covenant in David's prayer	65
3. 1. 4. Eschatological reading of the Davidic covenant	66
3. 1. 5. The Chronicler's faithful retention of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17	72
3. 2. Ideology against the revival of the Davidic dynasty	73
3. 2. 1. Solomon, not David as the protagonist of the Chronicler	73
3. 2. 1. 1. The lack of reproach toward Solomon	75
3. 2. 1. 2. The lack of Bathsheba narrative	76
3. 2. 1. 3. The totality of the cult in the Solomonic period	78
3. 2. 1. 4. Solomon's attraction in the Greek period	81
3. 2. 2. Anti-Samaritan polemic	83
4. Conclusion	90
III. The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chr 22:6-13	93
1. Setting	93
2. Textual Comparison	93
3. Further Issues	97
3. 1. Is 'peace' an indicator of messianism?	97
3. 2. Coexistence of unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant	100
4. Conclusion	101

IV.	The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chr 28:2-10	102
1.	Setting	102
2.	Textual Comparison	103
3.	Further Issues	107
3. 1.	Coexistence of unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant	108
3. 2.	Originality of 1 Chr 28:4-5	110
3. 3.	Implications of 1 Chr 28:4-5	115
4.	Conclusion	121
V.	The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 1:8-10	123
1.	Setting	123
2.	Synoptic Comparison	123
3.	Conclusion	127
VI.	The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 6:3-17, 40-42	128
1.	Setting	128
2.	Synoptic Comparison	128
2. 1.	1 Kgs 8:16//2 Chr 6:5-6	129
2. 2.	1 Kgs 8:21//2 Chr 6:11	131
2. 3.	1 Kgs 8:22-23//2 Chr 6:13	132
2. 4.	1 Kgs 8:52-53//2 Chr 6:40-42	135
3.	Further Issue: Identification of the Promises	141
4.	Conclusion	143
VII.	The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 7:17-22	145
1.	Setting	145
2.	Synoptic Comparison	145
3.	Conclusion	148
VIII.	The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 13:1-22	150
1.	Setting	150
2.	Synoptic Comparison	150
2. 1.	1 Kgs 15:1//2 Chr 13:1	151
2. 2.	1 Kgs 15:2//2 Chr 13:2	154
2. 3.	1 Kgs 15:3-5//omission in 2 Chronicles 13	158
3.	Further Issues	160
3. 1.	Arguments for the revival of the Davidic dynasty	160
3. 1. 1.	The Davidic kingdom as YHWH's kingdom	160
3. 1. 2.	Two foci of Abijah's speech	162
3. 1. 3.	The holy war motif	164
3. 1. 4.	The positive portrayal of Abijah	166
3. 1. 5.	שְׁמִיעוּנִי as the Chronicler's catchword for the address of his ideology	168
3. 1. 6.	בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ	170
3. 2.	Arguments against the revival of the Davidic dynasty	173
3. 2. 1.	Caquot	173

3. 2. 2. Pomykala	174
3. 2. 3. Riley	175
4. Conclusion	177
IX. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 21:2-7	179
1. Setting	179
2. Synoptic Comparison	179
2. 1. 2 Kgs 8:19//2 Chr 21:7	181
3. Conclusion	187
X. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 23:1-3	189
1. Setting	189
2. Synoptic Comparison	189
3. Conclusion	192
XI. Conclusion	194
Bibliography	199

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

As I submit my thesis to the University of Edinburgh, I would like to acknowledge a number of people who made this completion possible. My deep gratitude goes to my supervisor Professor Timothy H. Lim. Throughout my research, he has provided me with invaluable guidance and expertise, as well as warmth, encouragement, patience, and support as I hurdled all the obstacles in the completion of this work. I am also indebted to Prof. Hans M. Barstad, my second supervisor, and Prof. Graeme Auld and Prof. Lester L. Grabbe, who served as the internal examiner and external examiner respectively of this thesis. Their insightful comments were invaluable to me and are therefore much appreciated. My dear friends, Dr. Caroline Blyth and Rev. Shawn White proofread my thesis. I am grateful to them for their willingness to read my manuscripts and for their helpful suggestions. In addition, I appreciate my former teachers of Hebrew and Old Testament, and academic advisor at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Yale University, who led me into the fascinating world of the Old Testament: Prof. Willem VanGemeren, Prof. K. Lawson Younger, Prof James Hoffmeier, Prof. Richard Averbeck, Dr. David Pao, Dr. Sun-Myung Lyu, Prof Robert R. Wilson, and Prof. John J. Collins.

I am thankful to all the members of the Edinburgh Korean Church within which I had the privilege to serve as Senior Pastor while completing my thesis. They understood that their pastor needed to hide in a library carrel many times and supported my study as well as my ministry with their sincere prayers. I am also indebted to the prayers of my home church, Bongchun-Dong Church and its pastor, Rev Jindal Kim in Seoul, Korea. I also wish to thank my family for their unwavering love and support. As I wrestled with the Hebrew text of Chronicles, my wife Haejin had the more difficult task of wrestling with our two babies, Soeun and Jaeun. I also wish to express my heart-felt respect and gratitude to my parents, Elder Kyujong Hwang and Deaconess Woosook Lee, and my parents-in-law, Elder Nampil Park and Deaconess Ilpyung Roo for their faith in me and their sacrifice for their children.

Finally, I thank my Lord, Jesus Christ for giving me the strength to plod on throughout this research.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> , ed. D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992.
ANET	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> , ed. J. B. Pritchard. Princeton, 1969.
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BDB	<i>The Brown Driver Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i> , F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. Peabody, 1996.
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> , eds. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1990.
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZAW	Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CB	Coniectanea Biblica
CTM	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
DDD	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> , eds. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, P. W. van der Horst. Leiden, 1995.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
EvQ	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOTL	The Forms of the Old Testament Literature
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> , eds. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner. 2 vols. Leiden, 2001.
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HBT	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HS	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . ed. G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, 1962.
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>

JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KBo	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi</i> . Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orientgesellschaft 30, 36, 68-70, 72-73, 77-80, 82-86, 89-90. Leipzig, 1916-
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
KTU	<i>Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Uagrit</i> , eds M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1976.
LD	Lectio Divina
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LTQ	<i>Lexington Theological Quarterly</i>
LXX	Septuagint
LXX <sup>B</sup>	Codex Vaticanus
LXX <sup>O</sup>	Hexaplaric recension
LXX <sup>L</sup>	Lucianic recension
LXX <sup>R</sup>	Codex Veronensis
MT	Masoretic Text
NAB	New American Bible
NAC	The New American Commentary
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NCB	The New Century Bible Commentary
NEB	New English Bible
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NIB	<i>The New Interpreter's Bible</i> , ed. Leander E. Keck. 12 vols. Nashville, 1999.
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIDOTTE	<i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> , ed. W. A. VanGemeren. 5 vols. Grand Rapids, 1997.
NIV	New International Version
NIVAC	The NIV Application Commentary
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NJPS	New Jewish Publication Society
NKJV	New King James Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OTL	Old Testament Library
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RTP	<i>Revue de théologie et de philosophie</i>
RTR	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLDS	Society Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Studies Monograph Series
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> , eds. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1974-
THAT	Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament
TMSJ	<i>The Master's Seminary Journal</i>



<i>TrinJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TQ</i>	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>USQR</i>	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTSup</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum Supplements</i>
<i>WBC</i>	<i>Word Biblical Commentary</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

## I. Introduction

### 1. A Problem

Chronicles was composed in the postexilic period when the Jews were without their own king and were living under the rule of the Persian Empire and the Greek dynasties of the Ptolemies and Seleucids.<sup>1</sup> In view of the apparently eternal nature of the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:11b-16), this loss of sovereignty would have posed a difficult problem for the Jews.<sup>2</sup> To be sure, Zerubbabel, grandson of Jehoiachin, penultimate king of the Davidic kingdom, was appointed as governor of Yehud by the Persian king Darius (Hag 1:1) and received YHWH's promise of being his 'signet ring' (Hag 2:23); however, he could not and did not re-establish the kingdom of David.<sup>3</sup>

When the Jews lost their political leadership in the postexilic period, religious personnel appeared to play an increasingly important role as leaders of the Temple-centered community. Along with Zerubbabel, Joshua, the high priest of the Jewish community that had returned from the exile, led the project of rebuilding the Temple (Hag 1:1; Ezra 3:2).<sup>4</sup> The book of Chronicles reflects this Temple-centered community and deals in much detail with issues relating to the cultic personnel. The two main figures in Chronicles, David and Solomon, are presented respectively as the

---

<sup>1</sup> Here, the term 'Jews' (יהודים) carries ethnic connotations. Shaye J. D. Cohen points out that the term 'Jew' in modern English could convey religious overtones rather than having an ethnic sense. That is to say, in modern English, a 'Jew' could mean someone who believes and practices Judaism but is not a Jew in an ethnic sense. To avoid confusion, if יהודי occurs before the end of the second century B.C.E., Cohen translates it not as the religious term, 'Jew', but as the ethnic-geographic term, 'Judaean'. Lester L. Grabbe also notes that before the Roman period, the term יהודי was understood ethnically. See Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 69-70 and Lester L. Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period II* (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 153-154.

<sup>2</sup> Although the word בְּרִית ('covenant') does not occur in 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicles 17, God's promise of an eternal kingdom to David and his descendants of a kingdom and kingship is referred to as 'the covenant' elsewhere in the Old Testament (e.g., 2 Chr 13:5; 21:7).

<sup>3</sup> Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (London: SCM, 1992), 79.

<sup>4</sup> Joshua the high priest takes one wing of the leadership of the Jewish community returned from the Exile. However, as Deborah Rooke points out, Joshua's leadership does not have an effect on civil affairs; rather, its influence remains in the Temple-centred cultic arena. See Deborah W. Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 151.

one who prepares (1 Chr 22; 28:1-29:20), and the one who completes (2 Chr 2:1-5:1) the Temple building project. Furthermore, the Chronicler evaluates the Judaic kings who reigned after Solomon in relation to their piety and their service in the Temple.<sup>5</sup> Those who were considered ‘good’ kings worshipped God in the Temple according to the divine commandment, diligently repairing and restoring the Temple, whereas those who were considered ‘bad’ kings were negligent in their worship of YHWH and in their preservation of the Temple.

In the context of this postexilic Temple-centred cultic society, the question may be asked: Does the Chronicler hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom in view of the seemingly and eternally binding (עוֹלָם), unconditional Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:12-16; 1 Chr 17:11-14), or is he satisfied with its replacement by the postexilic, Temple-centered cultic society?

With regard to the Chronicler’s view of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom, scholarly opinion is divided. On the one hand, some scholars argue that the book of Chronicles advocates the re-establishment of the Davidic kingdom on the basis of the continued relevance of the covenant. That is, they suggest that the Davidic covenant remains operative in the future and underpins the future restoration of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, a number of scholars claim that the Chronicler is not

---

<sup>5</sup> ‘The Chronicler’ is used in this work to represent the author who is responsible only for the books of Chronicles. This is in accordance with scholars, such as Sarah Japhet and H. G. M. Williamson, who challenge the possibility of a common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. See Sarah Japhet, “The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew,” *VT* 18 (1968), 332-372; H. G. M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 5-82. See also R. Braun, *1 Chronicles*, WBC (Waco: Word Books, 1986), xx; Gary Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1-9*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 117; Steven L. McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, AOTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004), 21-27; Ralph W. Klein, *1 Chronicles*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 16.

<sup>6</sup> C. F. Keil, *The Books of the Chronicles*, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, trans. Andrew Harper (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1872), 223; J. W. Rothstein and J. Hänel, *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, KAT 17 (Leipzig: Deichertsche, 1927), 153; G. von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), 119-131; A. Noordtjij, “Les Intentions du Chroniste,” *RB* 49 (1940): 161-168; Martin Noth, *The Chronicler’s History*, trans. H. G. M. Williamson, JSOT Sup. 50 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 105; A. M. Brunet, “La Théologie du Chroniste: Théocratie et Messianisme,” *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*, eds., J. Coppens, A. Descamps, É. Massaux (Gembloux: Duculot, 1959) vol I: 384-397; D. N. Freedman, “The Chronicler’s Purpose,” *CBQ* 23 (1961): 436-442; W. F. Stinespring, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” *JBL* 80 (1961): 209-219. R. North, “The Theology of the Chronicler,” *JBL* 82 (1963): 379-381; J. D. Newsome, “Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler’s Purpose,” *JBL* 94 (1975): 201-217; H. G. M. Williamson, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” *TynBul* 28 (1979): 115-154; T. Im, *Das Davidbild in den Chronikbüchern* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1985), 184-185; Magne Saebo, “Messianism

interested in the revival of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>7</sup> Rather, they contend that the Chronicler's sole interest lies in the Temple and its cultus and it is through them that the Davidic covenant may be realized.

Scholars on both sides of this debate base their contentions upon textual considerations within Chronicles: in particular, its terminology, structure, genealogy, and its portrait of David. Thus, scholars supporting the former view cite terminological evidence from the text that they claim evokes the eschatological restoration of the Davidic kingdom: for example, the use of the phrase 'all Israel' (e.g., 1 Chr 11:1, 4; 12:39 (38); 14:8)<sup>8</sup>, אֶרֶצוֹת (‘lands’, e.g., 1 Chr 22:5; 2 Chr 13:9), a word which is normally used for chaotic situations outside of Israel<sup>9</sup>, and the exaggeration of the numbers of people (1 Chronicles 24-25), which reflect the ideal eschatological religious establishment in the restored future kingdom.<sup>10</sup> In terms of structure, it has also argued that the Chronicler's decision to jump directly to the narrative about David from the genealogy, while skipping the so-called ‘Salvation History’, implies his interest in the revival of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>11</sup> With regard to the genealogy in 1 Chronicles 1-9, those scholars who argue in favour of the Chronicler's interest in the restoration of the Davidic line point to the elaborate

---

in Chronicles?, ” *HBT* 2 (1980): 85-109; Brian E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, JSOT Sup 211 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 252.

<sup>7</sup> W. Rudolph, *Chronikerbücher*, HAT 21 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1955); “Problems of the Books of Chronicles,” *VT* 4 (1954): 401-409; Otto Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology*, trans. S. Rudman (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968); A. Caquot, “Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l’oeuvre du Chroniste?,” *RTP* 99 (1966): 110-120; P. R. Ackroyd, “History and Theology in the Writings of the Chronicler,” *CTM* 38 (1967), 512-515; Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 273-276; Joachim Becker, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*, trans. David E. Green (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1980), 79-82; S. J. De Vries, “Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles,” *JBL* 107 (1988), 636-639; W. Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, JSOT Sup 160 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 169-185; Kenneth Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*, SBLEJL 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 69-110; James T. Sparks, *The Chronicler's Genealogies* (Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 365.

<sup>8</sup> Rothstein and Hänel, *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, XLIII; Stinespring, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” 61; Im, *Das Davidbild in den Chronikbüchern*, 184-185.

<sup>9</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, 128.

<sup>10</sup> Stinespring, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” 214.

<sup>11</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, 120.

genealogy of the Davidide Zerubbabel in 1 Chr 3:17-22.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, with respect to the Chronicler's portrait of David, they also stress the sanitized presentation of David (e.g., the Chronicler's non-inclusion of the Bathsheba narrative and the rebellion of Absalom) that is found within these traditions.<sup>13</sup>

In contrast, scholars who claim that the Chronicler is uninterested in Davidic restoration argue that eschatological terminology is scarce and indistinct in Chronicles compared to the prophetic literature.<sup>14</sup> In addition, they suggest that the lack of hatred against other nations, which is common in other messianic prophecies, indicates the Chronicler's disinterest in the eschatological restoration of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, it is also noted that the Chronicler highlights David as 'the man of the Temple' more than 'the man of war' by inverting the order of 2 Samuel 5 (David's war against Philistines) and 2 Samuel 6 (David's transfer of the ark) in 1 Chronicles 13-14.<sup>16</sup> That is, the Chronicler's placement of the ark account prior to the war account indicates that his cultic interest prevails over political and military affairs.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the Chronicler's failure to mention the release of the Davidide Jehoiachin (2 Kgs 25:27-30) and his decision to end the book with Cyrus's order to restore the Temple are cited by some scholars as evidence to support the view that the Chronicler's principal interest lay in the Temple and its cultus rather than in the revival of the Davidic line.<sup>18</sup> Finally, scholars who adopt this reading of Chronicles

---

<sup>12</sup> Im, *Das Davidbild in den Chronikbüchern*, 184; J. A. Thompson, *1, 2 Chronicles*, NAC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 71. The term 'Davidide' means of the Davidic family or of Davidic descendant.

<sup>13</sup> Rothstein and Hänel, *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, XLIII; Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* 122, 131.

<sup>14</sup> Rudolph, *Chronikerbücher*, xxiii., "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," 408;

<sup>15</sup> Rudolph, "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," 409; Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 274-275.

<sup>16</sup> Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," 115.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> P. R. Ackroyd, "The Theology of the Chronicler," *LTQ* 8 (1973), 514; Becker, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*, 81-82; Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*, 203-204.

have also noted the insignificant place of David's genealogy in 1 Chr 2:3-4:23,<sup>19</sup> the presentation of the king's shortcomings in 1 Chronicles 21 and the portrayal of Solomon, rather than David, as the ideal figure within the book.<sup>20</sup>

It is widely agreed that the Davidic covenant forms a fundamental basis for the hope of the reestablishment of the Davidic kingdom. It seems to me, then, that the key to discovering the Chronicler's view of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom surely lies in uncovering his understanding of the Davidic covenant. An important issue is the Chronicler's understanding of the nature of the Davidic covenant; that is, was it a covenant that depended on the moral behaviour of kings or was it absolute and independent of any of the monarchs' deeds? In other words, was it conditional or unconditional? The Davidic covenant appears to be unconditional in its central texts of 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicles 17. Phrases – such as 'But I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you' (2 Sam 7:15),<sup>21</sup> and 'I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you' (1 Chr 17:13b) – indicate that, unlike the divine promise of kingship granted to Saul, this promise to David was eternal and not conditioned by what the Davidic kings actually did.

Elsewhere, however, the covenant appears to have been established on the premise that certain behaviour was required from the reigning king. In 1 Kgs 8:25, for instance, the Davidic line will continue, 'if only your children look to their way, to walk before me as you have walked before me' (cf., 1 Kgs 8:25//2 Chr 6:16; 1 Kgs 9:4-9//2 Chr 7:17-22).

If the covenant were conditional, then it would be easier for Jews to explain why the kingdom was lost; namely, the Israelites' disobedience resulted in the downfall of the kingdom. However, it is not so simple. As I will show in the

---

<sup>19</sup> Sparks holds that the Chronicler's genealogy forms a chiasmic structure centred upon the genealogy of cultic personnel, i.e., the sons of Aaron and the Levites in 1 Chr 6:33-38 (48-53). See Sparks, *The Chronicler's Genealogies*, 365.

<sup>20</sup> Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," 116.

<sup>21</sup> Hereafter, English translation is from NRSV unless indicated.

following, the difficulty lies in the coexistence of both the conditionality and unconditionality of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles as well as in Samuel-Kings

## 2. Review of Previous Scholarship

As mentioned above, scholars have yet to reach a consensus on how the Chronicler understood the revival of the Davidic kingdom in view of the Davidic covenant. Several issues need to be unpacked.

### 2. 1. Nathan's oracle

There is debate regarding how Nathan's oracle is used by the Chronicler. 1 Chr 17:4-14 differ from its synoptic text of 2 Sam 7:5-16 in three ways. First, the phraseology that describes the continuation of the Davidic kingship is **יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֵיד** in 2 Sam 7:12 whereas it is **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֵיךָ** in 1 Chr 17:11. Secondly, the possible chastisement of the Davidic offspring prescribed in 2 Sam 7:14 ('when he commits iniquity, I will correct him with the rod of men and the strokes of the sons of man') does not appear in Chronicles. Thirdly, there is a series of differences between the personal pronouns in 1 Chr 17:14 ('But I will confirm him in my house and in my kingdom forever, and his throne shall be established forever') and those of 2 Sam 7:16 ('Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever').

C. F. Keil argues that these three differences are not merely textual variations, but exegetical alterations that reflect the Chronicler's interest in the coming of the Messiah through the Davidic line.<sup>22</sup> While **יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֵיד** in 2 Sam 7:12 refers to Solomon, **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֵיךָ** in 1 Chr 17:11 refers to David's remote descendant, who will be the Messiah.<sup>23</sup> Keil contends that **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֵיךָ מִן** is not 'to belong to' but 'to arise or be born from', as in Gen 17:16 and Eccl 3:20.<sup>24</sup> Moreover, he argues that the Chronicler's exclusion of the chastisement from 2 Sam

---

<sup>22</sup> Keil, *The Books of the Chronicles*, 223-224.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 223.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

7:14 is understandable if we assume that the Messiah, who is free from sin and chastisement, is the inheritor of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>25</sup> According to Keil, the third difference may also be interpreted in light of messianic expectation. Whereas the promise in 2 Sam 7:16 is spoken *to David*, the promise in 1 Chr 17:16 is for *the seed of David*, that is, the Messiah whose throne shall be established forever in the kingdom of God.<sup>26</sup>

With regard to the contentious clause, **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֵיךָ** (1 Chr 17:11), H. G. M. Williamson disagrees with Keil by contending that it refers to Solomon based on the context of the chapter in which Solomon is referred to as the Temple builder.<sup>27</sup> According to Williamson, since **מִן הָיָה** could be rendered syntactically as either ‘be born’ or just ‘from among’, it is the context of the clause that provides the key for its exegesis and supports Solomon as the referent of this phrase.<sup>28</sup> The focal point for the interpretation of **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֵיךָ** is the use of **מִן הָיָה** within its context. In the following, I will discuss the use of **מִן הָיָה** in detail in other Old Testament texts as well as within the context of Nathan’s oracle.

With regard to the third difference, Keil holds that the change from the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun to 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun in 1 Chr 17:14 is indicative of the Chronicler’s expectation of the Messiah. However, this is an oversimplification and the exegetical changes must be seen in light of the chapter’s overall presentation of its shared material. There are more complex issues to explore, such as the meaning of ‘my house’ and the meaning of ‘establishing him in my house and my kingdom’, which I will detail in the chapters to follow.

As to the lack of the chastisement clause (2 Sam 7:14) in Chronicles, Williamson argues that it could be better understood if we assumed that the Chronicler is referring to the Temple builder, Solomon, as the inheritor of the

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 224.

<sup>27</sup> H. G. M. Williamson, “The Dynastic Oracle in the Books of Chronicles,” *Isaac Leo Seeligmann Volume*, eds., Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch. (Jerusalem: E Rubinstein’s Publishing House, 1983), 308.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 306-308.



kingdom, who does not go astray from God's commandments in Chronicles.<sup>29</sup> In other words, since Solomon is described as an impeccable figure, there is no need for chastisement. According to Williamson, David's reception of God's promise of the eternal dynasty, and Solomon's fulfilment of the conditions (i.e., obedience to God's commandments) make this promise unconditional after the death of Solomon.<sup>30</sup>

However, Williamson's further contention that Solomon's obedience to God's commandment makes the Davidic covenant eternal is not convincing. As Kenneth E. Pomykala points out, with reference to 2 Chr 6:16b, the conditions of the Davidic covenant are applied not just to Solomon but also to David's other descendants: 'There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel *'if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me'*'.<sup>31</sup> The succession of the Davidic throne is conditioned on the obedience of 'sons' rather than Solomon alone.

Pomykala maintains that the Davidic covenant in Chronicles is conditional and its nature can explain the downfall of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>32</sup> He argues that the lack of conditions in the covenant does not necessarily mean that it is 'unconditional'.<sup>33</sup> However, Pomykala has not adequately taken account of the unconditional elements in the text, such as 1 Chr 17:13 ('I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you'), which call his views into question. It is difficult to see how the covenant could only be conditional.

With regard to the fall of Judah, Pomykala also contends that the phrase עַד-עוֹלָם attached to the Davidic covenant is not to be understood as 'eternity' but as 'remote time'.<sup>34</sup> He finds a clue for this interpretation from another temporal phrase

---

<sup>29</sup> Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles," 135.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 154.

<sup>31</sup> Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*, 92-93.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 88-104.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 91-92.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 94-97.

לְמִרְחֹק in 1 Chr 17:17, which he translates as ‘far off’.<sup>35</sup> However, it will be shown in the following that his understanding of the temporal sense of עַד-עוֹלָם, based on לְמִרְחֹק, is open to challenge.

Pomykala follows his predecessors, Adam C. Welch and Wilhelm Rudolph, in seeing no hope expressed within Chronicles for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. The Davidic covenant has been discarded on account of the Israel’s disobedience.<sup>36</sup> Welch cites 1 Chr 28:7 to stress the significance of the Davidic descendants’ obedience to the Torah:<sup>37</sup>

I will establish his kingdom forever *if* he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today. (italics added)

Rudolph also negates the hope of restoration by stating that the Chronicler’s concern is not for the Davidic kingdom but the Temple and its cultus:

The failure of the Davidic dynasty could be borne, so long as the second pillar of the theocracy, the Jerusalem Temple, stood firm...The significance of the house of David for salvation was then limited to the fact that David and Solomon had created for the Temple those ordinances upon which the acceptable worship of the present community depended.<sup>38</sup>

Along this line, Pomykala minimizes the significance of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10 (‘He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever’) and 1 Chr 28:7, arguing that these are presented in the context of David’s commission to Solomon to build the Temple.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 96-97.

<sup>36</sup> Adam C. Welch, *Post-Exilic Judaism* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1935), 193., Rudolph, “Problems of the Books of Chronicles,” 404.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Rudolph, “Problems of the Books of Chronicles,” 409.

<sup>39</sup> Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*, 89-90.

D. N. Freedman and Steven L. McKenzie do not see the issue as unambiguously as Welch, Rudolph and Pomykala. There is ambivalence in the Chronicler's view of the nature of the Davidic covenant. 2 Chr 7:12-14 and 2 Chr 7:17-20 seem to advocate both a conditional and unconditional covenant:<sup>40</sup>

If my people who are called by my name humble themselves, pray, seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land. (2 Chr 7:14)

As for you, if you walk before me, as your father David walked, doing according to all that I have commanded you and keeping my statutes and my ordinances, then I will establish your royal throne, as I made covenant with your father David saying, 'You shall never lack a successor to rule over Israel'. (2 Chr 7:17-18)

Both Freedman, who underscores the overruling grace of God in 2 Chr 7:12-14, and McKenzie, who highlights the eternal aspect of the covenant in 2 Chr 7:14 as well as the 'conditional' aspect in 2 Chr 7:17-18, believe that the Chronicler expresses hope for the restored kingdom within the Davidic covenant.<sup>41</sup> The ambivalent nature of the covenant, its apparent conditionality and unconditionality, is clearly vital to the present thesis and I will attempt to untangle the complex nexus of issues in the following chapters.

## 2. 2. Solomon's prayer

The end of Solomon's prayer during the dedication of the Temple in 2 Chr 6:41-42 is another point of debate amongst scholars. In 1 Kgs 8:53, Solomon's prayer includes a recounting of YHWH's redemptive act in bringing Israel out of Egypt through Moses. By contrast, the Chronicler utilizes Psalm 132:8-10 with its reference to the Ark's close relationship to YHWH and the phrase **יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ**, which derives from Isa 55:3. G. von Rad, M. Noth, and M. Saebo assert that these differences tell us

---

<sup>40</sup> Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," 438-439; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 252.

<sup>41</sup> Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," 438-439; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 252.

something of the Chronicler's hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>42</sup>

However, their view is disputed by other scholars. Rudolph acknowledges the slightly heightened importance of the Davidic covenant in 2 Chr 6:41-42, but he minimizes its effect by saying that the theme of endurance of the Davidic dynasty is rarely found and is indistinct in Chronicles as compared to the prophetic literature.<sup>43</sup> Rudolph's reasoning is unconvincing exegetically as we shall show below.

Concerning חֶסֶדִּיךָ of 2 Chr 6:42, A. Caquot and S. Japhet insist that it should be read as a subjective genitive (i.e. the phrase does not mean God's loving-kindness for David, but rather David's faithfulness). They therefore do not see any hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom within this phrase.<sup>44</sup> The phrase חֶסֶדִּיךָ is crucial for this debate and I will discuss it in the following chapters and argue that it is better understood as an objective genitive.

### 2. 3. Abijah's speech

The Judaeen king Abijah's address against Jeroboam and the northern Israelites in 2 Chr 13:4-12 is another disputed passage. According to some, it accentuates the significance of the Davidic kingdom. Von Rad, for instance, argues that the Davidic kingship over Israel is described by the Chronicler as 'the covenant of salt' (2 Chr 13:5) and the naming of the Davidic kingdom as the kingdom of YHWH (e.g. 2 Chr 13:8) suggests the eschatological hope, transcendence, and godliness in the Davidic kingdom. For him, these points reinforce the Chronicler's hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom.<sup>45</sup>

W. Riley, by contrast to von Rad, claims that Abijah's resort to 'the covenant of salt' in 2 Chr 13:5 does not necessarily represent an unending Davidic dynasty. Moreover, the Chronicler's identification of the kingdom of David with the kingdom

---

<sup>42</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 127-128; Noth, *The Chronicler's History*, 105; Saebo, "Messianism in Chronicles?," 101.

<sup>43</sup> Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, xxiii., "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," 408.

<sup>44</sup> Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," 119; Sarah Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 604-605.

<sup>45</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 124-126.

of YHWH implies that David is a vassal of YHWH and not that the Davidides hold an eternal status.<sup>46</sup> Pomykala likewise denies that the ‘covenant of salt’ implies the enduring validity of the Davidic covenant.<sup>47</sup> He contends that if ‘the covenant of salt’ signifies God’s confirmation of the eternity of the Davidides, then one cannot explain the period from the fall of Judah to the Chronicler’s time (about 150-200 years) when Israel was without a Davidic king.<sup>48</sup> In the following, I will investigate the concept of the ‘covenant of salt’ and the description of the Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom, arguing for their significance in the Chronicler’s understanding of the eternal validity of the Davidic covenant.

Caquot too sees little relevance in the ‘covenant of salt’ in 2 Chr 13:5. He argues that a distinction should be maintained between Abijah and the Chronicler’s views. For him, Abijah’s speech reflects the Judaeen king’s view and not the Chronicler’s confession.<sup>49</sup> While one must distinguish between the Chronicler’s point of view and that of a character within its narrative, Caquot’s point is weakened when it is realized that 2 Chr 13:5 is not paralleled in the Deuteronomistic history. It is the Chronicler’s *Sondergut*.

#### 2. 4. Other disputed passages

Von Rad adduces two exegetical variances in 2 Chr 7:18 (cf., 1 Kgs 9:5) to support his view that the Chronicler envisions a re-establishment of the Davidic kingdom. He argues that דְּבַרְתִּי was changed to כְּרַתִּי, and מִעַל כֶּסֶּא יִשְׂרָאֵל to מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל:<sup>50</sup>

וְהִקְמַתִּי אֶת-כֶּסֶּא מִמְּלֻכְתְּךָ עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעֶלְם כַּאֲשֶׁר  
דְּבַרְתִּי עַל-דָּוִד אָבִיךָ לֵאמֹר לֹא-יִכָּרֵת לְךָ אִישׁ מִעַל כֶּסֶּא

<sup>46</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 173.

<sup>47</sup> Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*, 99-100.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Caquot, “Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l’oeuvre du Chroniste?,” 119.

<sup>50</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 124.

יִשְׂרָאֵל

Then I will establish the throne of your kingdom over Israel forever, as I spoke unto David, your father, saying, 'A man upon the throne of Israel shall not be cut off for you'. (1 Kgs 9:5, my translation)

וְהִקְמֹתִי אֶת כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתְךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר כָּרַתִּי לְדָוִיד אָבִיךָ  
לֵאמֹר לֹא-יִכָּרֵת לְךָ אִישׁ מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל

Then I will establish the throne of your kingdom as I covenanted with David, your father saying, 'A man ruling in Israel shall not be cut off for you'. (2 Chr 7:18, my translation)

For von Rad, the first alteration evokes the hope of restoration in the Davidic covenant, while the second adaptation, which is cited from the well known messianic passage of Mic 5:1 (2), indicates strongly the Chronicler's interest in the coming of the Davidic Messiah.<sup>51</sup> Riley, however, disagrees with von Rad about the first variance. For him, it is meant to accentuate the covenantal nature of the word to David, rather than to reinforce the eternity of the Davidic covenant.<sup>52</sup> In addition, he notes that כָּרַתִּי follows the condition of the covenant in 2 Chr 7:17.<sup>53</sup> Riley's work is valuable in the way that it points out the conditional element of the Davidic covenant, but it fails to address the rationale: why does the Chronicler want to accentuate the covenant in this way?

Concerning what he considered the 'messianic' phrase, מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל of 2 Chr 7:18, Riley denies that it is an alteration made by the Chronicler.<sup>54</sup> He proposes that the Chronicler simply followed his *Vorlage*, which is the Hebrew text behind 3 Kgdms 9:5 in the LXX (paralleled in LXX 2 Chr 7:18):<sup>55</sup>

καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸν θρόνον τῆς βασιλείας σου ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καθὼς ἐλάλησα τῷ Δαυὶδ πατρὶ σου λέγων οὐκ ἐξαρθήσεται ἡ σὺν σοὶ ἀνὴρ ἡγούμενος ἐν Ἰσραὴλ

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 172-174.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 173.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

Then I will establish the throne of your kingship over Israel forever, as I spoke to your father David, saying, ‘There shall not be taken from you a man *ruling in Israel*’. (3 Kgdms 9:5, my translation)

With regard to מֹשֶׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל of 2 Chr 7:18, I will therefore attempt to ascertain the most plausible *Vorlage* of the Chronicler between 1 Kgs 9:5 of the MT and 3 Kgdms 9:5 of the LXX, and argue that מֹשֶׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל is the Chronicler’s own exegetical shaping rather than his use of a textual variant that is also attested in the text of 3 Kgdms 9:5.

A related issue is the difference between the text of 2 Chr 21:17 and 2 Kgs 8:19. In place of the phrase, ‘for the sake of David’ (2 Kgs 8:19), the Chronicler includes a longer clause, ‘because of the covenant that he had made with David’ in 2 Chr 21:17:

Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David *for the sake of the covenant that he covenanted with David*, and since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever. (my translation)

Additionally, the Chronicler uses the phrase ‘the house of David’ for ‘Judah’ (2 Kgs 8:19) within this verse. While von Rad and Williamson read the Chronicler’s hope for a restoration of the Davidic kingdom within these discrepancies, Riley remains opposed to such a reading.<sup>56</sup> Rather, he claims that the emphasis on the Davidic covenant in 2 Chr 21:7 in fact refers to the need for the dynasty until such a time that the lamp (נֵר), which is, according to him, the Temple or Temple cultus, is established.<sup>57</sup> However, as will be shown below, ‘the lamp’ may be otherwise explained.

Finally, in the reign of Athaliah, the sole non-Davidic ruler in the history of Judah, the high priest Jehoiada conspires to restore the Davidic line through Joash proclaiming that ‘Here is the king’s son! Let him reign, as the LORD promised concerning the sons of David’ (2 Chr 23:3).

---

<sup>56</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 124; Williamson, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” 148; Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 173.

<sup>57</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 173.

Given that Jehoiada's proclamation is not paralleled in the Deuteronomistic history, von Rad and Williamson view this as evidence for the Chronicler's longing for the lost kingdom of David.<sup>58</sup> On the contrary, Pomykala asserts that Jehoiada's proclamation does not spell out the Chronicler's longing for the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom but rather his conviction of YHWH's continued commitment to the Davidic family in the midst of the threat against the Davidides.<sup>59</sup> According to Pomykala, if someone focuses on the renewal of the Davidic dynasty in this passage after two hundred years of the demise of Judah, his or her focus would be inappropriate.<sup>60</sup> Pomykala does not see a restoration motif in the Davidic covenant of Chronicles because he views the Davidic covenant as conditional. In his view, because the Israelites did not meet the conditions, there is no place for restoration. However, as I will discuss below, the weakness of Pomykala's view is his failure to consider the unconditional aspect of the Davidic covenant.

## 2. 5. Terminology

In scholarly circles, the view supporting the Chronicler's hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom is often referred to as 'eschatological' while the position supporting the Chronicler's satisfaction with the *status quo* – that is, the postexilic Temple-centred cultic society – is known as 'theocratic'.<sup>61</sup> Here, the term 'eschatology' incorporates both a narrow and a broad sense. Eschatology in its narrow sense concerns the end time of the world accompanying cosmic catastrophe ordered by God, whereas eschatology in a broader sense concerns the expectation of better

---

<sup>58</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 124; Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles," 148-149.

<sup>59</sup> Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*, 101-102.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 102.

<sup>61</sup> Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology*, 111; Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles," 115; Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, 139. For a more general discussion about the concept of theocracy see Jeremiah W. Cataldo, *A Theocratic Yehud?: Issues of Government in a Persian Period*, LHBOTS 498 (New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 118-169.



things in the context of the existing world.<sup>62</sup> The ‘eschatological’ position may be further subdivided into the two categories: ‘messianic’ and ‘royalistic’.<sup>63</sup> The ‘messianic’ viewpoint expects the coming of the Messiah at the end of time<sup>64</sup> whereas the ‘royalistic’ perspective anticipates the political restoration of the Davidic kingdom without assuming such an end time.

This survey of scholarship shows that several interrelated issues remain unresolved in the study of the Chronicler’s understanding of the nature of the Davidic covenant. It is for this reason that we must take a comprehensive look at all the relevant passages in 1 and 2 Chronicles in order to help us better understand what was his understanding of the fulfilment of the Davidic covenant.

### 3. Methodology

What I should like to do in this work is to ask the following question: does the book of Chronicles support *in the Davidic covenant* the restoration of the Davidic kingdom for the future or does it replace God’s promise of an eternal Davidic kingship with the Temple and its cultus? I will attempt to answer this question by making a thorough investigation of all the texts in Chronicles that deal with the Davidic covenant. Although the importance of this covenant within Chronicles is widely recognized by scholars, there has not been a comprehensive, exegetical study of the Davidic covenant in relation to the Chronicler’s hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. I will not deal with other issues, such as the genealogy of Zerubbabel, the absence of the release of Jehoiachin, or the lack of hatred against other nations in Chronicles; these topics are important in themselves but are secondary to the purpose of this work. However, I will discuss these related issues in

---

<sup>62</sup> Sarah Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, trans. Anna Barber (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997), 499-500; Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, 135-135.

<sup>63</sup> Williamson, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” 154; Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, 154.

<sup>64</sup> Keil, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, 223; Rothstein and Hänel, *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, XLIII-XLIV, 153; Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, 119-131; Stinespring, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” 209-219.

the final chapter, once I have ascertained the Chronicler's understanding of the Davidic covenant in relation to the restoration of the monarchy.

The method adopted in this investigation will be exegetical. I will investigate by detailed exegesis all the passages to which the Davidic covenant is referred in Chronicles: 1 Chr 17:1-27; 22:6-13; 28:2-10; 2 Chr 1:8-10; 6:3-17, 40-42; 7:17-22; 13:1-22; 21:2-7; and 23:1-3.<sup>65</sup> In order to discern fully the import of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles, I will conduct textual, linguistic, semantic, syntactical, and grammatical investigations through a close reading of the texts. I will discuss the texts which refer to the Davidic covenant in their literary context and, where appropriate, compare them to their synoptic parallels in Samuel-Kings. Where the passages in Chronicles have parallels in Samuel-Kings, it will be important to compare them both in order to understand better the Chronicler's view. If there is no parallel passage to be found in Samuel-Kings, then one could argue that it is part of the Chronicler's *Sondergut* and will reveal the Chronicler's ideology, even though the extra-biblical source cannot be specifically identified.

Since the Chronicler's source may be different from the *textus receptus* of the MT Samuel-Kings, the Chronicler's deviation may not be the result of the Chronicler's *Tendenz* but rather is the result of his using different sources.<sup>66</sup> Thus, in

---

<sup>65</sup> I regard 2 Chr 6:3-17 and 40-42 as one passage, for which, see below. Riley similarly lists passages in Chronicles which mention the Davidic covenant though he does not present a comprehensive treatment of them. His list, moreover, is rather narrow: 1 Chr 17:10-14, 17, 23-27; 22:6-10; 28:2-7; 2 Chr 1:8-9; 6:4-10, 15-17, 42; 7:17-18; 13:5; 21:7; 23:3. See Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 29-30.

<sup>66</sup> W. E. Lemke and McKenzie demonstrate that the Chronicler's source text of Samuel-Kings is not necessarily the *textus receptus* of the Samuel-Kings found in the MT. While there are occasions when passages in Chronicles differ from their synoptic equivalent in Samuel-Kings, these Chronicles passages do however agree with the texts of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, 4QSam<sup>b</sup>, 4QSam<sup>c</sup> or 4QKgs. See W. E. Lemke, "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History" (Th. D. diss., Harvard University, 1963); Steven L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, HSM 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984), 33-73. A. G. Auld contends that the authors of both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles shared an earlier and briefer text, which they both expanded upon. For example, in explaining the difference between 1 Kgs 8:53 and 2 Chr 6:40-42, he suggests that the two texts are independent additions to the shared text of the long prayer of Solomon (1 Kgs 8:12-50a//2 Chr 6:1-39). See A. G. Auld, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994). Steven L. McKenzie raises a question about Auld's theory, arguing that some passages in Chronicles (e.g., 1 Chr 15:29; 17:6, 10; 20:5; 29:27; 2 Chr 10:15; 22:7-8; 32) indicate the Chronicler's familiarity with the text of Samuel-Kings as it is found in the MT though the Chronicler does not include the text in Chronicles. For instance, although the Chronicler does not include Ahijah's oracle of the division of the Davidic kingdom (1 Kgs 11:29-39), the Chronicler does refer to it in 2 Chr 10:15. See Steven L. McKenzie, "The Chronicler as Redactor," *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, eds. M. P. Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic press, 1999),

my investigation of the nine passages in Chronicles, it will be important to consider any relevant synoptic texts in the Qumran scrolls (4QSam<sup>a</sup>, 4QSam<sup>b</sup>, 4QSam<sup>c</sup>, 4QKgs, 4QChr), in order to discern fully the Chronicler's *Tendenz* on the Davidic covenant.

The main text I will use in this research is the Masoretic Text (MT) (*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, eds., K. Elliger and W. Rudolph), as well as the Septuagint (LXX) (*Septuaginta*, ed., Alfred Rahlfs), when required. For English translations of the MT, I will primarily cite the NRSV along with my own translations. For English translations of the LXX, I will use NETS as the default version along with my translations. Versification follows the MT and the LXX and if the versification of the English translation is different from that of the MT and LXX, I will add it in a parenthesis.

---

80-87. Auld responds to McKenzie's critique in "What was the Main Source of the Books of Chronicles," *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, 91-99. Most recently, Auld defends his view in "Synoptic David: The View from Chronicles," *Raising Up a Faithful Exegete*, eds. K. L. Noll and Brooks Schramm (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 117-128.

## II. The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chronicles 17:1-27

### 1. Setting

Nathan's oracle of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is preceded by David's transfer of the ark of the covenant of YHWH from Obed-Edom to Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 15-16). Having transferred the ark to Jerusalem, David thinks of building a house for the ark. However, Nathan's oracle interferes with David's plan as the oracle reveals that it is not David who will build a house for YHWH, but YHWH who will build the house for David. 1 Chronicles 17 consists of two parts: Nathan's oracle of God's royal promise for David and his family (vv. 1-15), and David's prayer in response to the promise (vv. 16-27). In particular, elements of the Davidic covenant are present in vv. 10b-14, v. 24b, and v. 27a. Several differences in the following synoptic comparison between 1 Chronicles 17 and its parallel text, 2 Samuel 7, disclose the Chronicler's *Tendenz*.

### 2. Synoptic Comparison

#### 2. 1. 2 Sam 7:6//1 Chr 17:5

The first noteworthy point of synoptic comparison is in 1 Chr 17: 5, where מִמְצָרִים of 2 Sam 7:6 is not present:

כִּי לֹא יָשַׁבְתִּי בְּבַיִת לְמִיּוֹם הָעֲלֵיתִי אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל  
מִמְצָרִים וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְאֶהְיֶה מְתַהַלֵּךְ בְּאַהֶל וּבְמִשְׁכָּן

I have not lived in a house since the day I brought up the people of Israel *from Egypt* to this day, but I have been moving about in a tent and a tabernacle. (2 Sam 7:6)

כִּי לֹא יָשַׁבְתִּי בְּבַיִת מִן־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר הָעֵלִיתִי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל  
עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְאֶהְיֶה מְתַהַלֵּךְ אֶל־אַהֶל וּמִמִּשְׁכָּן

For I have not lived in a house since the day I brought out Israel to this very day, but I have been from tent to tent and from a tabernacle. (1 Chr 17:5, my translation)

In Japhet's judgment, the lack of 'Egypt' in 1 Chr 17.5 should be viewed in the same light as the Chronicler's exclusion of the so-called Salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*), which includes the Exodus and Conquest narratives.<sup>67</sup> After the long genealogy in the first nine chapters, the Chronicler skips the Exodus-Conquest narrative and jumps straight to the short narrative of Saul's death, which functions as a steppingstone to the David narrative. Japhet holds that the limited role of the Exodus in Chronicles is not only detected in the omission of the Salvation history but also in the omission of the reference to the Exodus from Egypt.<sup>68</sup> As for the Chronicler's preference of the Davidic covenant to the Sinai covenant, R. North states:

The primary vehicle of Israel's 'chosenness', he shows, was not Moses on Sinai at all. No, it was David on Zion! Only some such firm and avowed intention accounts for the ruthlessness with which he suppresses any allusion to the whole exodus event.<sup>69</sup>

Since one popular explanation for the lack of the Exodus narrative in Chronicles is the Chronicler's preference for the Davidic covenant as opposed to the Sinai covenant of the Exodus, we need to explore whether the Chronicler did indeed intentionally suppress the Sinai covenant.

Comparing Chronicles with the Deuteronomistic history, there are four more places, in addition to 1 Chr 17:5, where the Chronicler does not mention 'Egypt' in relation to the Exodus: these are 2 Chr 3:2; 6: 11, 39, 40:

(1) 1 Kgs 6:1//2 Chr 3:1-2

---

<sup>67</sup> Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, 379-380.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 385.

<sup>69</sup> North, "Theology of the Chronicler," 378. Along the same lines, A. M. Brunet asserts that 'Si l'élection d'Abraham et l'alliance que Dieu a conclue avec lui amorcent en quelque sorte le royaume de Dieu, l'Exode et l'alliance du Sinaï ne sont que des étapes qui acheminent Israël vers le régime politique parfait: la théocratie davidique. Dans ces conjuncture, on comprend facilement que la mention de l'Exode et meme celle de l'alliance du Sinaï deviennent superflues au moment où Dieu vient de poser son dernier acte dans la réalisation de la théocratie, en permettant au fils de David d'édifier le Temple. Ce qui importe alors c'est de souligner l'alliance par excellence, celle que Dieu a conclue avec David.' in "La Théologie du Chroniste Théocratie et Messianisme," 391

In the four hundred eightieth year after the Israelites came out of the land of *Egypt*, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Ziv, which is the second month, he began to build the house of the LORD. (1 Kgs 6:1)

Solomon began to build the house of the LORD in Jerusalem on Mount Moriah, where the LORD had appeared to his father David, at the place that David had designated, on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite. He began to build on the second day of the second month of the fourth year of his reign. (2 Chr 3:1-2)

Having prepared all the needed materials and personnel for the building of the Temple (2 Chronicles 2), Solomon begins to build the Temple in 2 Chronicles 3. 2 Chr 3:1-2 is the introduction of the actual Temple building narrative, where any reference to 'Egypt' is absent. While the Deuteronomist begins the Temple building narrative with a temporal phrase counting the time passed from the Exodus out of Egypt, the Chronicler begins with a geographical detail.

(2) 1 Kgs 8:21//2 Chr 6:11

There I have provided a place for the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with our ancestors when he brought them out of the land of *Egypt*. (1 Kgs 8:21)

There I have set the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with the people of Israel. (2 Chr 6:11)

This is a part of Solomon's dedication speech after he finished building the Temple and had brought up the ark of YHWH. While מִצְרַיִם appears in the subordinate clause, בְּהוֹצִיאָו אֶתֶּם מִמִּצְרָיִם in 1 Kgs 8:21, it is wanting in 2 Chr 6:11.

(3) 1 Kgs 8:49-51//2 Chr 6:39

Then hear in heaven your dwelling place their prayer and their plea, maintain their cause and forgive your people who have sinned against you, and all their transgressions that they have committed against you; and grant them compassion in the sight of their captors, so that they may have compassion on them (vv. 49-50) for they are your people and heritage, which you brought out of *Egypt*, from the midst of the iron-smelter. (1 Kgs 8:49-51)

Then hear from heaven your dwelling place their prayer and their pleas, maintain their cause and forgive your people who have sinned against you. (2 Chr 6:39)

This is also part of Solomon's dedication prayer. 2 Chr 6:39 is shorter than 1 Kgs 8:49-50, and 1 Kgs 8:51, which include God's deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, is absent in Chronicles.

(4) 1 Kgs 8:52-53//2 Chr 6:40-42

Let your eyes be open to the plea of your servant, and to the plea of your people Israel, listening to them whenever they call to you.<sup>53</sup> For you have separated them from among all the peoples of the earth, to be your heritage, just as you promised through Moses, your servant, when you brought our ancestors out of *Egypt*, O Lord GOD. (1 Kgs 8:52-53)

Now, O my God, let your eyes be open and your ears attentive to prayer from this place.<sup>41</sup> 'Now rise up, O LORD God, and go to your resting place, you and the ark of your might. Let your priests, O LORD God, be clothed with salvation, and let your faithful rejoice in your goodness.<sup>42</sup> O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one. Remember your steadfast love for your servant David'. (2 Chr 6:40-42)

Once again, in Solomon's dedication prayer, 2 Chr 6:40 is shorter than 1 Kgs 8:52, and God's promise to Moses, which mentions the Exodus from Egypt (1 Kgs 8:53), is not present in Chronicles. Instead, the Chronicler includes God's promise to David (2 Chr 6:42).

However, there are also four places in Chronicles where reference to 'Egypt' in relation to the Exodus occurs as in the Deuteronomistic history: 1 Chr 17:21; 2 Chr 5:10; 6:5; 7:22-8:1.

(1) 2 Sam 7:23//1 Chr 17:21

Who is like your people, like Israel, one nation on the earth whom God went to redeem for himself as a people and to make a name for himself, and to do a great thing for you and awesome things for your land, before your people whom you redeemed for you from *Egypt*, nations and their gods? (2 Sam 7:23, my translation)

Who is like your people Israel, one nation on the earth whom God went to redeem to be his people, making for yourself a name for great and terrible things, in driving out nations before your people whom you redeemed from *Egypt*? (1 Chr 17:21)

Having received the awesome promise of the dynasty through Nathan, David gives thanks to God in his responsive prayer. David praises God for his redemption of Israel from Egypt.

(2) 1 Kgs 8:9//2 Chr 5:10

There was nothing in the ark except the two tablets of stone that Moses had placed there at Horeb, where the LORD made a covenant with the Israelites, when they came out of the land of *Egypt*. (1 Kgs 8:9)

Nothing was in the ark except the two tablets which Moses put there at Horeb, when the LORD made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they had come out of *Egypt*. (2 Chr 5:10)

When the work of the Temple building was finished, Solomon brings the ark into the Temple. The temporal phrase, ‘when they had come out of Egypt’ occurs in the description of the ark.

(3) 1 Kgs 8:16//2 Chr 6:5

Since the day that I brought my people Israel out of *Egypt*, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, that my name might be there; but I chose David to be over my people Israel. (1 Kgs 8:16)

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of *Egypt*, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, so that my name might be there, and I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel. (2 Chr 6:5)

This is Solomon’s quote of what God promised to David. As seen in 1 Chr 17:5 (2 Sam 7:6), God has not dwelt in a fixed house from the Exodus from Egypt until Solomon’s completion of the Temple.



(4) 1 Kgs 9:9//2 Chr 7:22

And the answer will be, 'Because his people forgot the LORD their God, who brought their ancestors out of *Egypt*, and they worshiped other gods instead. That is why the LORD has brought all these disasters upon them'. (1 Kgs 9:9)

Then they will say, 'Because they abandoned the LORD the God of their ancestors who brought them out of the land of *Egypt*, and they adopted other gods, and worshiped them and served them; therefore he has brought all this calamity upon them'. (2 Chr 7:22)

Upon Solomon's dedication of the Temple, God appears to Solomon and says that if the Israelites forsake God's decrees and turn away from his commandments, then God would uproot Israel from their land. Then, neighboring peoples would remark on Israel's affliction by identifying YHWH as the God who redeemed the Israelites from Egypt.

As seen above synoptic comparison between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, the Chronicler shares the reference to Egypt of the Exodus in four places out of nine. Our question here is whether the Chronicler excludes 'Egypt' in order to suppress the Exodus-Sinai tradition and simultaneously magnify the Davidic covenant. One can answer negatively based on the following reasons.

The strongest argument comes from the Chronicler's own lack of consistency in dealing with the reference of 'Egypt' of the Exodus. While מִצְרַיִם is absent in God's oracle through Nathan in 1 Chr 17:5, it occurs in David's responsive prayer to the oracle in 1 Chr 17:21. If the Chronicler intends to exclude 'Egypt' completely, he would not exclude it one place and include it in another within the same narrative unit. The same phenomenon is observed in 2 Chronicles 6. Whereas the Chronicler includes 'Egypt' in v. 5, he excludes it in v. 11 within the same speech by Solomon to the whole assembly of Israel. Furthermore, the Chronicler's inconsistency in referencing 'Egypt' of the Exodus is seen in the two identical contexts. When God declares that his dwelling has not been in a built house since the Exodus, he uses similar expressions in 1 Chr 17:5 and 2 Chr 6:5:

Since the day I brought out Israel to this very day (1 Chr 17:5)

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of *Egypt* (2 Chr 6:5)

As one can see, the Chronicler excludes any reference to 'Egypt' in the former verse but he mentions it in the latter.

In addition, the contextual evidence does not support the notion that the lack of 'Egypt' of the Exodus can be attributed to the Chronicler's magnification of the Davidic covenant over the Sinai covenant. In 2 Chr 6:11 one finds one of the five places where 'Egypt' is absent:

There I have set the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with the people of Israel. (2 Chr 6:11)

Unlike 2 Chr 6:11, its parallel text, 1 Kgs 8:21, includes at the end the subordinate clause, 'when he brought them out of the land of *Egypt*'. If the lack of this subordinate clause indicates the weakening of the Sinai covenant in Chronicles, it is difficult to understand the presence of a more direct reference to the Sinai covenant as 'the ark, in which the covenant of the Lord that he made with the people of Israel'. If the Chronicler desired to suppress the Mosaic-Sinai covenant of the Exodus in order to magnify the Davidic covenant, he would be more interested in excluding more direct references to the Mosaic covenant, such as the law of Moses, the Torah of Moses, and the statutes and the ordinances that the Lord commanded through Moses, than the more obtuse reference to Egypt. However, the text of Chronicles does not provide any hint of suppressing those more direct references of the Mosaic-Sinai covenant. The synoptic comparison between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles on the use of those references reveals that there are more occurrences of Moses' law in Chronicles than in Samuel-Kings. Chronicles contains nine references to the law of Moses:

1 Chr 22:13	‘the statutes and the ordinances that the Lord commanded Moses for Israel’
2 Chr 5:10	‘the two tablet that Moses put there at Horeb, where the Lord made a covenant’
2 Chr 23:18	‘the law of Moses’
2 Chr 25:4	‘the law in the book of Moses’
2 Chr 30:16	‘the law of Moses’
2 Chr 33:8	‘all the law, the statutes and the ordinances given through Moses’
2 Chr 34:14	‘the book of the law of the Lord given through Moses’
2 Chr 35:6	‘the word of the Lord by Moses’
2 Chr 35:12	‘the book of Moses’

In Samuel-Kings there are seven references to the law of Moses:

1 Kgs 2:3	‘the law of Moses’
1 Kgs 8:9	‘the two tablets of stone that Moses had placed there at Horeb, where the Lord made a covenant’
2 Kgs 14:6	‘the book of the law of Moses’
2 Kgs 18:6	‘the commandments that the Lord commanded Moses’
2 Kgs 18:12	‘his covenant-all that Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded’
2 Kgs 21:8	‘all the law that my servant Moses commanded them’
2 Kgs 23:25	‘all the law of Moses’

Out of those occurrences in Chronicles, there are four synoptic places, 1 Kgs 8:9//2 Chr 5:10, 2 Kgs 11:18//2 Chr 23:17-18, 2 Kgs 14:6//2 Chr 25:4, 2 Kgs 21:8//2 Chr 33:8, where we cannot find any vestige of the Chronicler’s attempt to suppress references to the Mosaic law. In three passages, 2 Chr 5:10; 25:4; 33:8, references to the Mosaic law occur as in 1 and 2 Kings, and in 2 Chr 23:17-18, a reference to the Mosaic law occurs while the reference is not present in its parallel passage, 2 Kgs 11:18.

Clearly, the Chronicler adheres to the Davidic covenant. However, it is doubtful that the Chronicler purposely suppresses allusions to the Mosaic-Sinai covenant of the Exodus. The above synoptic comparison reveals that the absence of references to ‘Egypt’ cannot be satisfactory proof that the Chronicler showed a preference for the Davidic covenant over the Sinai covenant. Moreover, the Chronicler does not suppress more direct references to the Mosaic covenant such as ‘the law of Moses’ and, in fact, adds a reference of the Mosaic law. Thus, the lack of

מִמִּצְרַיִם in 1 Chr 17:5 cannot be an indicator of the Chronicler's longing for the suppression of the Sinai covenant for the sake of the magnification of the Davidic covenant.

The lack of 'Egypt' in 1 Chr 17:5 is may be explained by the Chronicler's abridgement of the parallel text, 2 Sam 6. In 1 Chr 17:5-6, the narrow context of this absence, the Chronicler makes his text concise by omitting other words besides מִמִּצְרַיִם, such as בְּנֵי (x2, 2 Sam 7:6, 7) and אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל (2 Sam 7:7), without significantly changing the meaning of the passage:

כִּי לֹא יָשַׁבְתִּי בְּבַיִת לְמִיּוֹם הָעֲלֵיתִי אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל  
מִמִּצְרַיִם וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְאֶהְיֶה מְתַהַלֵּךְ בְּאַהֶל וּבְמִשְׁכָּן  
בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר־הִתְהַלַּכְתִּי בְּכָל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַדָּבָר דִּבַּרְתִּי  
אֶת־אַחַד שְׂפָטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי לְרֹעוֹת אֶת־עַמִּי  
אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר לָמָּה לֹא־בִנִיתֶם לִי בַיִת אֲרָזִים

I have not lived in a house since the day I brought up *the sons* of Israel *from Egypt* to this day, but I have been moving about in a tent and a tabernacle. <sup>7</sup> Wherever I have moved about among all *the sons* of Israel, did I ever speak a word with any of the tribal leaders of Israel, whom I commanded to shepherd my people *Israel*, saying, 'Why have you not built me a house of cedar?' (2 Sam 7:6-7, my translation)

כִּי לֹא יָשַׁבְתִּי בְּבַיִת מִן־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר הָעֲלֵיתִי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל  
עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְאֶהְיֶה מְאֹהֵל אֶל־אַהֶל וּמִמִּשְׁכָּן  
בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר־הִתְהַלַּכְתִּי בְּכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל הַדָּבָר דִּבַּרְתִּי  
אֶת־אַחַד שְׂפָטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי לְרֹעוֹת אֶת־עַמִּי  
לֵאמֹר לָמָּה לֹא־בִנִיתֶם לִי בַיִת אֲרָזִים

For I have not lived in a house since the day I brought out Israel to this very day, but I have lived in a tent and a tabernacle. <sup>6</sup> Wherever I have moved about among all Israel, did I ever speak a word with any of the judges of Israel, whom I commanded to shepherd my people, saying, 'Why have you not built me a house of cedar?' (1 Chr 17:5-6)

## 2. 2. 2 Sam 7:12//1 Chr 17:11

Another important synoptic comparison in light of the Davidic covenant lies in the different relative clauses between אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמִּעֵיךְ of 2 Sam 7:12 and אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ of 1 Chr 17:11:

When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, **אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֶיךָ** and I will establish his kingdom. (2 Sam 7:12)

When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ** and I will establish his kingdom. (1 Chr 17:11)

With regard to this discrepancy, Keil contends that **אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֶיךָ** of 2 Sam 7:12 refers to Solomon, but **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ** of 1 Chr 17:11 designates David's remote descendant, who is the Messiah.<sup>70</sup> According to Keil, 'הִיָּה מִן' does not mean 'be of one, i.e. to belong to' but 'to arise, be born, or go forth from one'.<sup>71</sup> To support his claim, Keil adduces Gen 17:16 and Eccl 3:20, where 'הִיָּה מִן' is used in a sense of 'to arise, be born, or go forth from one'. Let us first examine Gen. 17:16:

וּבֵרַכְתִּי אֹתָהּ וְגַם נָתַתִּי מִמֶּנָּה לָךְ בֶּן וּבֵרַכְתִּיהָ וְהָיְתָה  
לְגוֹיִם מְלָכִי עַמִּים מִמֶּנָּה יִהְיוּ

I will bless her, and moreover I will give you a son by her. I will bless her, and she shall give rise to nations; kings of peoples shall come from her. (Gen 17:16)

This is God's blessing that will allow Abraham to have offspring through his wife Sarai. 'הִיָּה מִן' is seen in 'מִמֶּנָּה יִהְיוּ', which is translated as 'they will be from her', and 'they' refers to the antecedent, 'kings of people' (מְלָכִי עַמִּים). Since Isaac, the son of Sarai/h is not called מֶלֶךְ ('king'), the 'kings of people' must refer to remote descendants of Sarai/h. In this sense, according to Keil, 'הִיָּה מִן' is used to mean 'to arise, be born, or go forth from one'. However, there is a different sense between מִמֶּנָּה יִהְיוּ of Gen 17:16 and מִבְּנֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה of 1 Chr 17:11. While the prepositional object in מִמֶּנָּה יִהְיוּ is singular הָ ('her') and the sense of preposition מִן is limited to 'origin' (from), the prepositional object in מִבְּנֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה is the plural בְּיָנֶיךָ ('your sons') and מִן here can carry the

<sup>70</sup> Keil, *The Books of the Chronicles*, 223. Von Rad also follows Keil in *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 123-124.

<sup>71</sup> Keil, *The Books of the Chronicles*, 223.

partitive sense (of) as well as the sense of origin (from).<sup>72</sup> To apply the use of **היה מן** of Gen 17:16 onto **אשר יהיה מבניך** of 1 Chr 17:11, one must first explain that **מן** in 1 Chr 17:11 that carries the sense of ‘origin’ rather than a partitive sense. But Keil does not explain this. Namely, though the meaning of **יהיו ממנה** is plainly ‘they will be from her’, **אשר יהיה מבניך** of 1 Chr 17:11 leaves room for two possible meanings: ‘the one who shall arise from your sons’ and ‘the one who shall be one of your sons’.

The other passage Keil adduces is Eccl 3:20:

הַכֹּל הוֹלֵךְ אֶל-מָקוֹם אֶחָד הַכֹּל הָיָה מִן-הָעָפָר וְהַכֹּל שָׁב  
אֶל-הָעָפָר

All go to one place; all are from the dust, and all turn to dust again.

This is part of the Qoheleth’s speech about man’s origin and destiny. The Hebrew phrase, ‘**היה מן**’ is included in **הכל היה מן-הָעָפָר** (‘all are from the dust’). As Williamson expounds, the point of the argument is that while Adam himself is called as ‘dust’ directly in Gen 2:7, Qoheleth describes Adam’s descendants indirectly by way of ‘**היה מן**’:<sup>73</sup>

וַיֵּצֵר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם עָפָר מִן-הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפַּח  
בְּאַפָּיו נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

Then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and  
breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a  
living being. (Gen 2:7, my translation)

As Williamson maintains, in Gen 2:7 there is direct relationship between Adam and dust. However, it is not convincing to view **הכל** (‘all’) in Eccl 3:20 as Adam’s descendants excluding Adam. There is no indication in Eccl 3:20 that Qoheleth distinguishes Adam and his descendants through the use of **הכל** to designate Adam’s

<sup>72</sup> Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 212-214.

<sup>73</sup> Williamson, “The Dynastic Oracle in the Books of Chronicles,” 307.

descendants. In **הַכֹּל** Qoheleth refers to men in general including Adam. If **הַכֹּל** designates men in general, Keil's use of Eccl 3:20 as corroborative evidence is questionable.

In sum, though Keil attempts to prove the sense of 'to arise, be born, or go forth from one', 'remoteness', 'indirectness' in the Hebrew phrase, '**הָיָה מִן**' by adducing the use of '**הָיָה מִן**' in Gen 17:16 and Eccl 3:20, the investigation of the two passages only reveals the irrelevance of the two verses for his argument. Contrary to Keil's contention, the Hebrew phrase '**הָיָה מִן**' carries more 'direct' and 'close' sense than 'indirect' and 'remote' sense as seen the following two examples, Mal 1:9 and 2 Chr 22:7:

(1) Mal 1:9

**וְעַתָּה חֲלוּ-נָא פְנֵי-אֵל וַיַּחֲנֹנוּ מִיָּדְכֶם הָיְתָה זֹאת הַיֵּשָׁא  
מִכֶּם פָּנִים אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת**

And now implore the favour of God, that he may be gracious to us.  
This is from your hand. Will he show favour to any of you? says the  
LORD of hosts. (my translation)

The phrase, '**הָיָה מִן**' is used in **הָיְתָה זֹאת מִיָּדְכֶם** ('this is from your hand'). In this prophecy against unholy priests, Malachi reminds the priests of their detestable practices in sacrifices:

O priests, who despise my name. And you say, 'How have we despised your name?' When you offer polluted bread (**לֶחֶם**) upon my altar. And you say, 'How have we polluted you?' By saying that the table of the Lord is contemptible. And when you offer the blind (**עִוֵּר**) for sacrifice, is it not evil? And when you offer the lame (**פֶּסֶחַ**) and sick (**חֲלָה**), is it not evil? Offer it to your governor! Will he be pleased with you? says the Lord of hosts. (Mal 1:6b-8, my translation)

**הָיְתָה זֹאת מִיָּדְכֶם** in **זֹאת מִיָּדְכֶם** refers to the detestable practices described in the previous verses of Mal 1:6b-8. In RSV, it is rendered as 'gift' and **מִיָּדְכֶם**

הַיְתָה זֹאת is translated as, ‘With such a gift from your hand’. However, it is unlikely that the feminine pronoun זֹאת corresponds to the sacrificial gifts in the masculine forms (חֶלֶה, פֶּסַח, עֹר, לֶחֶם). In the clause, מִיִּדְכֶם הַיְתָה זֹאת, Malachi stresses that direct connection between the detestable sacrificial practice and the priests by saying this is done not by others but by ‘you’.

(2) 2 Chr 22:7

וּמֵאֱלֹהִים הַיְתָה תְּבוּסַת אַחֲזִיָּהוּ לְבוֹא אֶל־יֹרָם וּבְבֹאוֹ  
יֵצֵא עִם־יְהוֹרָם אֶל־יְהוּא בֶן־נִמְשִׁי אֲשֶׁר מָשַׁחוּ יְהוָה  
לְהַכְרִית אֶת־בֵּית אַחָאָב

But it was ordained by God that the downfall of Ahaziah should come about through his going to visit Joram. For when he came there he went out with Jehoram to meet Jehu son of Nimshi, whom the LORD had anointed to destroy the house of Ahab.

2 Chr 22:7 shows the Chronicler’s use of ‘הִיָּה מִן’ in the initial clause, וּמֵאֱלֹהִים הַיְתָה תְּבוּסַת אַחֲזִיָּהוּ (lit. ‘The downfall of Ahaziah was from God’). Ahaziah, who does evil in the eyes of YHWH as the house of Ahab has done (1 Chr 22:4), is judged by God. The Chronicler expresses the direct relationship between God and the downfall of Ahaziah by using the phrase, ‘הִיָּה מִן’. Namely, the clause means: ‘The downfall of Ahaziah was from God himself’.

Thus Keil’s attempt to argue for the Chronicler’s messianism in the alteration from אֲשֶׁר יְהִיָּה מִבְּנִיָּד to אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמְּעֵיָד is unsuccessful. The discrepancy is more likely due to stylistic variation than any substantial theological motivation. In a divine speech, the Chronicler prefers the term בֶּן than a visceral term, מְעֵה, which originally meant entrails or intestines (2 Sam 20:10; 2 Chr 21:15).<sup>74</sup> In fact, the interchangeable relationship between מִן הִיָּה and מִן יֵצֵא is attested in the texts of

<sup>74</sup> H. Van den Bussche, “Le texte de la prophétie de Nathan sur la dynastie davidique (2 Sam 7 – 1 Chr 17),” *ETL* 24 (1948), 386; Sara Japhet, “Interchanges of Verbal Roots in Parallel Texts in Chronicles,” *HS* 28 (1987), 17; “מְעֵה,” *HALOT* I, 609.



the Old Testament. I. L. Seeligmann shows the parallelism of **מִן יֵצֵא** of Gen 17:6 with **מִן הִיָּה** of v. 16 of the same chapter:<sup>75</sup>

וְהִפְרֵתִי אֶתְךָ בְּמֵאֵד מְאֹד וְנָתַתִּיךָ לְגוֹיִם וּמְלָכִים מִמֶּנִּי יֵצְאוּ  
I will make you exceedingly fruitful; and I will make nations of you,  
and kings shall come from you. (Gen 17:6)

וּבֵרַכְתִּי אֶתָּה וְגַם נָתַתִּי מִמֶּנָּה לְךָ בֵּן וּבֵרַכְתִּיהָ וְהִיָּתָה  
לְגוֹיִם מְלָכִי עַמִּים מִמֶּנָּה יֵהְיוּ  
I will bless her, and moreover I will give you a son by her. I will bless  
her, and she shall give rise to nations; *kings of peoples shall come from*  
*her.* (Gen 17:16)

Williamson also finds in Jeremiah 30:21 that both **מִן הִיָּה** and **מִן יֵצֵא** are used synonymously:

וְהָיָה אֲדִירוֹ מִמֶּנּוּ וּמִשְׁלֹ מִקִּרְבּוֹ יֵצֵא  
Their prince *shall be one of their own*, their ruler *shall come from their*  
*midst.*

With regard to the variance between **אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֵיךְ** and **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ**, the LXX does not give the difference any significance in translation. The LXX reads both relative clauses equally as ὃς ἔσται ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου (lit. ‘who will be from your bowels’). Most of all, the text plainly confines **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ** to the one who shall build the house (**הוּא יִבְנֶה-לִּי בַּיִת**), which, clearly refers to the Temple of God in the following verse, and the promise is fulfilled through Solomon (2 Chr 3:1; 5:1).

It is possible that the Chronicler’s wording, **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ** links to the ‘son’ in 1 Chr 17:13, ‘I will be a father to him, and he shall be a *son* to me’.<sup>76</sup> In sum, there is no satisfying evidence that the Chronicler alters

<sup>75</sup> I. L. Seeligmann, “Researches into the Criticism of the Masoretic Text of the Bible,” *Tarbiz* 25 (1955/1956), 128-129.

<sup>76</sup> Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 333.

אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֵיךָ to אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֶיךָ for the sake of messianic colouring. The variance is not so much theological as stylistic and אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֵיךָ still plainly refers to Solomon.

After the contested phrases, אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֵיךָ and אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֶיךָ, the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler choose different words in the subsequent clauses, one opting for מִמְּלֻכָתוֹ and the other מַלְכוּתוֹ respectively:

וַיְהִינֵחִי אֶת־מִמְּלֻכָתוֹ ('And I will establish his kingdom', 2 Sam 7:12)

וַיְהִינֵחִי אֶת־מַלְכוּתוֹ ('And I will establish his kingdom', 1 Chr 17:11)

This variance does not seem to carry any significance concerning the nature of the future Davidic kingdom. מַלְכוּת is commonly viewed as a late biblical term that is semantically equated with מִמְּלָכָה. Both terms refer to 'dominion', 'kingship', and 'kingdom'.<sup>77</sup> Since the semantic range of the two words overlaps and the use of מַלְכוּת in the Late Biblical Hebrew is prominent, it would seem that the selection of מַלְכוּת over מִמְּלָכָה is attributable to the Chronicler's choice of a word more commonly used in his time.<sup>78</sup> Whereas there are only two occurrences of מַלְכוּת in Samuel-Kings (1 Sam 20:31; 1 Kgs 2:12), the Chronicler utilizes it 28 times.<sup>79</sup> מִמְּלָכָה occurs a good number of times in both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, 29 times<sup>80</sup> and 22 times<sup>81</sup> respectively.

While מַלְכוּת occurs in 1 Chr 17:11, it is absent in the next verse in comparison to 2 Sam 7:13:

<sup>77</sup> BDB 574-575; HALOT I 592-593, 595.

<sup>78</sup> Philip J. Nel, "מלך," NIDOTTE II, 957. The Late Biblical Hebrew is the Hebrew of later books of the Bible that differ from that of the preexilic corpus. See Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, HSM (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), 1.

<sup>79</sup> 1 Chr 11:10; 12:24 (23); 14:2; 17:11, 14; 22:10; 26:31; 28:5, 7; 29:25, 30; 2 Chr 1:1, 18 (2:1); 2:11 (12); 3:2; 7:18; 11:17; 12:1; 15:10, 19; 16:1, 12; 20:30; 29:19; 33:13; 35:19; 36:20, 22

<sup>80</sup> 1 Sam 10:18; 13:13, 14; 24:21 (20); 27:5; 28:17; 2 Sam 3:10, 28; 5:12; 7:12, 13, 16; 1 Kgs 2:46; 5:1 (4:21); 9:5; 10:20; 11:11, 13, 31, 34; 12:26; 14:8; 18:10 (x2); 2 Kgs 11:1; 14:5; 15:19; 19:15, 19

<sup>81</sup> 1 Chr 16:20; 29:11, 30; 2 Chr 9:19; 11:1; 12:8; 13:5, 8; 14:4 (5); 17:5, 10; 20:6, 29; 21:3, 4; 22:9, 10; 23:20; 25:3; 29:21; 32:15; 36:23

הוא יבנה־בית לשמי וכננתי את־כסא ממלכתו עד־עולם  
He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of  
*his kingdom* forever. (2 Sam 7:13)

הוא יבנה־לי בית וכננתי את־כסאו עד־עולם  
He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever.  
(1 Chr 17:12)

The absence of ממלכה does not seem to weaken in any sense the importance of the Davidic kingdom for the Chronicler. The absence could be explained by the Chronicler's intention of making the two declarative clauses concise, in the same way that he appears to have shortened יבנה־בית לשמי of 2 Sam 7:13 to יבנה־לי בית in 1 Chr 17:12. Thus, the textual minus of ממלכה in 1 Chr 17:12 is not so much an omission but an intentional, stylistic abridgement of כסא ממלכתו to כסאו.

#### 2. 3. 2 Sam 7:14-15//1 Chr 17:13

It is noteworthy that the so-called chastisement clause in 2 Sam 7:14 is not present in 1 Chr 17:13:

אשר בהעותו והכחתי בשבט אנשים ובנגעי בני אדם  
When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as  
mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings.

Thus, we can compare 2 Sam 7:14-15 with 1 Chr 17:13 as follows:

I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. *When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings.* But I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. (2 Sam 7:14-15)

I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you. (1 Chr 17:13)

To account for this absence Keil explains that, as זרעך ('your seed') in 1 Chr 17:11 refers to the Davidic Messiah, there is no need to mention what would be tantamount

to a theoretical transgression and punishment.<sup>82</sup> Von Rad likewise holds that the omission of the chastisement clause signifies the Chronicler's hope for the coming of the Davidic Messiah.<sup>83</sup> However, as we showed that **אֲשֶׁר יְהִי מִבְּנֵי דָוִד** of 1 Chr 17:11 most likely refers to Solomon, this line of reasoning for the textual minus is called into question.

Another explanation of the textual minus is to appeal to the *Tendenz* of the Chronicler. E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen assert that the Chronicler would be uncomfortable to speak of any expected fault of David's house through the mouth of YHWH.<sup>84</sup> Lemke counters, however, by suggesting that throughout the book the Chronicler speaks of the sins and chastisements of many kings of Judah.<sup>85</sup> The Chronicler even records how David sins against God in taking a census of Israel, and how God subsequently punished him (1 Chr 21:1-22:1). Of the twenty one kings of Judah after David, seventeen kings are viewed negatively in Chronicles, whether on the whole or a part of their reigns: Rehoboam (2 Chr 12:14), Asa (2 Chr 16:7-9), Jehoshaphat (2 Chr:19:2-3; 20:35-37), Jehoram (2 Chr 21:6-7, 12-13), Ahaziah (2 Chr 22:3-4), Athaliah (2 Chr 22:10), Joash (2 Chr 24: 24), Amaziah (2 Chr 25:2, 15-16, 20, 27), Uzziah (2 Chr 26:16), Ahaz (2 Chr 28:1-2, 19, 22; 29:19), Hezekiah (2 Chr 32:25), Manasseh (2 Chr 33:2, 19), Amon (2 Chr 33:22-23), Josiah (2 Chr 35:22), Jehoiakim (2 Chr 36:5, 8), Jehoiachin (2 Chr 36:9), Zedekiah (2 Chr 36:12-13)

Some scholars suggest that the lack of the chastisement clause implies the Chronicler's 'conditionalization' of the Davidic covenant.<sup>86</sup> Whereas the promise of YHWH's **חַסְדּוֹ** follows the possible iniquity and chastisement clause in 2 Sam 7:14-15, the Chronicler only includes the promise of YHWH's **חַסְדּוֹ** without the iniquity and chastisement clause in 1 Chr 17:13. According to this view, by excluding a

---

<sup>82</sup> Keil, *The Books of the Chronicles*, 223.

<sup>83</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 123.

<sup>84</sup> E. A. Curtis & A. A. Madsen, *The Books of Chronicles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1910), 227.

<sup>85</sup> Lemke, "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History," 40-41.

<sup>86</sup> See Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 334; Becker, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*, 671; Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 73.

possible case of iniquity, the Chronicler intends to convey that the Davidic covenant does not transcend the iniquity of the Davidic family but its efficacy depends on the faithful obedience of the Davidic offspring.

Japhet asserts that if the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant is the main point of 2 Sam 7:14-15, then this unconditionality is not retained in 1 Chr 17:13.<sup>87</sup> The comparison of the וְ of וְחֶסְדִּי of 1 Chr 17:13 betrays the different senses of the two texts:

וְחֶסְדִּי לֹא-יָסוּר מִמֶּנּוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר הֶסְרֹתִי מִעַם שָׂאוּל אֲשֶׁר  
הֶסְרֹתִי מִלִּפְנֵיךָ

*But my steadfast love will not turn away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. (2 Sam 7:15, my translation)*

וְחֶסְדִּי לֹא-אֶסִּיר מִמֶּנּוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר הֶסִּירוֹתִי מֵאִשֶׁר הָיָה לִפְנֵיךָ

*And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you. (1 Chr 17:13, my translation)*

Whereas the וְ of 2 Sam 7:15 would be most naturally rendered as ‘but’ after the chastisement clause, the וְ of 1 Chr 17:13, after the adoption formula, ‘I shall be his father and he shall be my son’, would be aptly translated ‘and’. The וְ of the former sentence carries the concessive sense, ‘in spite of’, which seems to underscore the unconditionality of the promise while the וְ of the latter sentence is less emphatic for the unconditional aspect of the promise.

However, if the Chronicler excluded the chastisement clause in order to make the Davidic covenant conditional, how can we explain the Chronicler’s retaining of the next clause, ‘And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you’? Here YHWH speaks about his different dealing with David in comparison with his dealings with one ‘who is before you’, which is an indirect reference to Saul. Then what is the difference more specifically? The difference certainly is not revealed in their obedience to God. When they faithfully walk in the way of YHWH, his חֶסֶד does not depart from them. Then God’s different dealing with David and Saul is betrayed when they deviate from his commandments. That is

---

<sup>87</sup> Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 334.

to say, although YHWH's דָּוָד left Saul when he was unfaithful to him,<sup>88</sup> it would not depart from David despite the transgression of the Davidic house. Consequently, the unconditional character of the Davidic covenant is not erased by the exclusion of the chastisement clause. If the Chronicler desired to make the Davidic covenant conditional, he would have excluded not only the chastisement clause but also the ensuing clause, 'And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you'.

In addition, the adoption formula ('I will be his father and he shall be my son') could be seen as an indicator of the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant. As Schniedewind notes, the adoption formula is found in the Code of Hammurabi in which a father adopts a slave-child by the declaration, 'You are my son':<sup>89</sup>

When a seignior's first wife bore him children and his female slave also bore him children, of the father during his lifetime has ever said 'My children!' to the children whom the slave bore him, thus having counted them with the children of the first wife, after the father has gone to (his) fate, the children of the slave shall share equally in the goods of the paternal estate, with the first-born, the son of first wife, receiving a preferential share. However, if the father during his life time has never said 'My children!' to the children whom the slave bore him after the father has gone to (his) fate, the children of the slave may not share in the goods of the paternal estate along with the children of the first wife.<sup>90</sup>

Concerning the use of the powerful adoption formula in the Nathan's oracle, William Johnstone states:

The nature of the relationship between God and Davidic king can only be expressed in the closest familial terms, 'father' and 'son'. Here is a solemn act of adoption, with again, the use of emphatic personal

---

<sup>88</sup> 'So Saul died for his unfaithfulness; he was unfaithful to the LORD in that he did not keep the command of the LORD; moreover, he had consulted a medium, seeking guidance, and did not seek guidance from the LORD. Therefore the LORD put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David son of Jesse'. (1 Chr 10:13-14)

<sup>89</sup> William M. Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 39

<sup>90</sup> "The Code of Hammurabi," trans., Theophile J. Meek, *ANET* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950), 173.

pronouns: 'I shall become father to him; and he shall become son to me'. The bond thus transcends even that of covenant: it goes beyond the voluntary, contractual status of a mere agreement between two parties and has become the necessary and inescapable tie as between of the same family. It is a relationship that is irrevocable; the loyalty within it is unconditional.<sup>91</sup>

If, following Johnstone, we conclude that the Chronicler maintains the unconditional character of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 17:13, then we are left with an apparent incongruity. How could this unconditional nature be seen together with 1 Chr 28:6-7; 2 Chr 6:16; and 2 Chr 7:17-20 where the Davidic covenant appears to be qualified?:

He said to me, 'It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts, for I have chosen him to be a son to me, and I will be a father to him. I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today'. (1 Chr 28:6-7)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him, saying, 'There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me'. (2 Chr 6:16)

As for you, if you walk before me, as your father David walked, doing according to all that I have commanded you and keeping my statutes and my ordinances, then I will establish your royal throne, as I made covenant with your father David saying, 'You shall never lack a successor to rule over Israel'. But if you turn aside and forsake my statutes and my commandments that I have set before you, and go and serve other gods and worship them, then I will pluck you up from the land that I have given you; and this house, which I have consecrated for my name, I will cast out of my sight, and will make it a proverb and a byword among all peoples. (2 Chr 7:17-20)

Both the conditional and unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant exist in Chronicles as well as in the Deuteronomistic history. There is tension and the common explanation is that it derives from the redaction of the Deuteronomistic

---

<sup>91</sup> William Johnstone, *1 & 2 Chronicles I*, JSOTSup (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 205-206.

history.<sup>92</sup> This approach views the covenant of 2 Samuel 7 as originally unconditional, and the contingencies as the secondary development of the Deuteronomist who needs to account for the destruction of the Davidic kingdom by the Babylonian empire.<sup>93</sup> The Deuteronomist justifies the downfall of the Davidic kingdom in the Israelites' failure to meet the condition, which is to keep the Mosaic law. Thus, it is commonly understood that the unconditional Davidic covenant of 2 Samuel 7 derives from a pre-Deuteronomistic source distinct from the later dynastic and conditional promise.<sup>94</sup>

When we turn to Chronicles, it seems more difficult to explain the coexistence of the conditional and unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant. While the unconditionality and conditionality of the covenant in the Deuteronomistic history can be accounted for by the two different redactional layers, the pre-Deuteronomistic and Deuteronomistic or preexilic and (post)exilic, the writing of Chronicles takes place in the postexilic period when the Davidic kingdom has been destroyed.

The question is why the Chronicler left both the unconditional and conditional aspects of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles. Considering the Chronicler's dynamic utilization of his source, had he wished to do so he could have reduced the two formulations of the covenant into one unified promise, either as unconditional or conditional. In this line of thinking, one would expect that it would be more likely that the Chronicler would opt for the conditional form of the covenant, given that he wrote in the postexilic period when there was no Davidic kingdom. If so, then the question becomes more specific; why did the Chronicler leave in the unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant?

I find the answer in the organic relationship between the unconditional and conditional aspects of the dynastic promise. The Chronicler would see the two aspects of the promise as complementary rather than contradictory; they are two sides of one

---

<sup>92</sup> Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, CB (Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1976), 276; Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, 109; M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 89-99.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, 29; M. Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch and other Studies* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), 250-259.



coin. The Davidic covenant is conditional in the sense that the kingdom has been punished, destroyed, and has ceased to function while it is unconditional in the sense that YHWH's **רַחֲמָנָּה** would not depart from it though the kingdom goes through the time of chastisement due to their unfaithfulness. In other words, the Chronicler believes and hopes for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty after the period of God's discipline is over.

1 Chr 17:13 is crucial for understanding the uniqueness of God's promise to David:

And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you.

When Saul was unfaithful and did not keep his commandments, YHWH took away his mercy (**רַחֲמָנָּה**) from Saul's house, and his would-be dynasty ended and his kingdom was turned over to David (1 Chr 10:13-14). Unlike this promise to Saul, however, God's assurance to the Davidic house remains, in that he would not take his mercy from it. The Davidic kingdom could, and would, be punished when it transgressed, but the kingdom would be restored according to God's steadfast mercy.

The combination of both conditional and unconditional features of the Davidic covenant is not unique. In ancient Near Eastern regulations the two aspects coexist:

After you, your son and grandson will possess it, nobody will take it away from them. If one of your descendants sins the king will prosecute him at his court. Then when he is found guilty... if he deserves death he will die. But nobody will take away from the descendant of Ulmi-Tešup either his house or his land in order to give it to a descendant of somebody else.<sup>95</sup>

This Hittite document is a treaty between Hattušiliš III (or Tudhalyaš IV) and Ulmi-Tešup of Dattaša. In the event that Ulmi-Tešup's descendants commit sins, they will

---

<sup>95</sup> *KBo* IV, 10., cited by M. Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in Old Testament and Ancient Near East," *JAOS* 90, (1970), 189.

be punished accordingly, but Ulmi-Tešup's house and land are unconditionally granted for his offspring.

Another document of the ancient Near East illustrates the combination of conditionality and unconditionality:

Nobody in the future shall take away this house from <sup>d</sup>U-manava (or Tešup-manava), her children, her grandchildren and her offspring. When anyone of the descendants of <sup>d</sup>U-manava provokes the anger of the kings... whether he is to be forgiven or whether he is to be killed, one will treat him according to the wish of his master but his house they will not take away and they will not give it to somebody else.<sup>96</sup>

This is a royal decree of Tudhaliyaš IV and Puduhepa for the descendants of Šahurunuwaš, a Hittite official. Once again, the descendants of <sup>d</sup>U-manava are to be punished if they provoke the anger of kings, but their house is granted to their family regardless of their sins.

In the Old Testament, Psalm 89 precisely reflects this organic relationship between the unconditional and conditional aspects of the Davidic covenant:

I have found my servant David; with my holy oil I have anointed him  
...  
Forever I will keep my steadfast love for him, and my covenant with him will stand firm. I will establish his line forever, and his throne as long as the heavens endure.  
If his children forsake my law and do not walk according to my ordinances, if they violate my statutes and do not keep my commandments, then I will punish their transgression with the rod and their iniquity with scourges;  
But I will not remove from him my steadfast love, or be false to my faithfulness. I will not violate my covenant, or alter the word that went forth from my lips. Once and for all I have sworn by my holiness; I will not lie to David. His line shall continue forever, and his throne endure before me like the sun. It shall be established forever like the moon, an enduring witness in the skies. Selah. (Ps 89: 21-38 (20-37))

The inclusion of the enduring nature of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 17:13

---

<sup>96</sup> *KBo* XXXI, 43, 50., cited by Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in Old Testament and Ancient Near East," 189-190.

means that the Chronicler must not have regarded the downfall of Judah in 586 BC as the abandonment of the Davidic covenant. It would seem that for the Chronicler the period from the fall of Judah to his own time may have been the time of God's discipline for Israel. Based on God's promise of unceasing חֶסֶד for Israel, the Chronicler would hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom. For the Chronicler, the promise to David is not an expendable, expired covenant, but an enduring promise which also plants the seed of the future restoration of Israel.

In 1 Chr 17:13, the Chronicler underscores YHWH's חֶסֶד for the Davidic house more than in its synoptic text, 2 Sam 7:15:

וְחֶסְדִּי לֹא-יִסּוּר מִמֶּנּוּ

But my steadfast love will not turn away from him (2 Sam 7:15, my translation)

וְחֶסְדִּי לֹא-אֶסִּיר מֵעַמּוֹ

And I will not take my steadfast love from him. (1 Chr 17:13)

The Chronicler's emphasis is two-fold. First, by using the first person *hifil* form, אֶסִּיר, the Chronicler stresses YHWH's own will.<sup>97</sup> Second, the emphatic double preposition מֵעַמּוֹ underscores YHWH's attachment to Solomon.<sup>98</sup> In these emphases, the Chronicler discloses his hope for the restoration of the Davidic house in YHWH's steadfast love.

The absence of the chastisement clause in Chronicles is consistent with its flawless portrayal of King Solomon, the Temple builder.<sup>99</sup> The Chronicler portrays Solomon as an ideal king throughout the first nine chapters of 2 Chronicles; he does not include his alleged wrongdoings, such as his intermarriage with foreign women, his turning to their gods, and his building of high places for the foreign gods (cf., 1 Kings 11).

<sup>97</sup> Cf., אֶסִּיר is attested in LXX 2 Sam 7:15: τὸ δὲ ἔλεός μου οὐκ ἀποστήσω ἀπ' αὐτοῦ...

<sup>98</sup> Johnstone, *1 & 2 Chronicles* I, 206.

<sup>99</sup> Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 334; Williamson, "Eschatology in Chronicles," 135; Braun, *1 Chronicles*, 199.

2. 4. 2 Sam 7:16//1 Chr 17:14

The focal point of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is verse 14:

וְהֶעֱמַדְתִּיהוּ בְּבֵיתִי וּבְמַלְכוּתִי עַד־הָעוֹלָם וְכִסְאוֹ  
יִהְיֶה נָכוֹן עַד־עוֹלָם

But I will confirm him in my house and in my kingdom forever, and his throne shall be established forever.

2 Sam 7:16, the parallel text of 1 Chr 17:14, reads as follows:

וְנָאֲמַן בֵּיתְךָ וּמַמְלַכְתְּךָ עַד־עוֹלָם לִפְנֵי כְסִאֲךָ  
יִהְיֶה נָכוֹן עַד־עוֹלָם

Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever.

‘Your (David’s) house and your kingdom’ of 2 Sam 17:16 corresponds to ‘my (YHWH’s) house and my kingdom’ in 1 Chr 17:14, and ‘your throne’ of 2 Sam 17:16 matches ‘his (Solomon’s) throne’ in 1 Chr 17:14. The identification of בְּבֵיתִי in 1 Chr 17:14 is pivotal to the discussion of the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant. Does it mean ‘Temple’ or ‘kingdom’? If it is rendered as the Temple, the house of YHWH, then it can buttress the position that the Davidic covenant is realized through the Temple and its cultus. This position accords with Rudolph’s claim:

The failure of the Davidic dynasty could be borne so long as the second pillar of the theocracy, the Jerusalem Temple is stood firm.<sup>100</sup>

The LXX’s rendering of the two verses is different from that of the MT:

καὶ πιστωθήσεται ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος  
ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἀνωρθωμένος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

<sup>100</sup> Rudolph, “Problems of the Books of Chronicles,” 404.

And his house and his kingdom shall be made sure forever before me, and his throne shall be established forever. (2 Kgdms 7:16, my translation)

καὶ πιστώσω αὐτὸν ἐν οἴκῳ μου καὶ ἐν βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος καὶ ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἀνωρθωμένος ἕως αἰῶνος.  
And I will confirm him in my house and in his reign forever. And his throne shall be established forever. (1 Chr 17:14, NETS<sup>101</sup> )

One notices that the focus has shifted from David to Solomon in LXX 2 Sam 17:16 by the change of the suffix: ‘your house and your kingdom...your throne’ to ‘his house and his kingdom... and his throne’. In LXX 1 Chr 17:14, the first person suffix of the MT is likewise changed to the third person: ‘my kingdom’ to ‘his kingdom (reign)’. Lemke’s chart is helpful for seeing the difference.<sup>102</sup>

	1. House	2. Kingdom	3. Throne	Referring to whom?
2 Sam 17:16 (MT)	your	your	your	David
2 Sam 17:16 (LXX)	his	his	his	Solomon
1 Chr 17:14 (MT)	my	my	his	YHWH (1 and 2) Solomon (3)
1 Chr 17:14 (LXX)	my	his	his	YHWH (1) Solomon (2 and 3)

Although it is difficult to explain all the variations of the suffixes, what is evident is that there is a noticeable change in Chronicles; God will establish him (Solomon) in the house of God.

Concerning the reference of בְּבֵיתִי, let us first examine the use of בֵּית in 1 Chronicles 17. There are fourteen occurrences of בֵּית in 1 Chronicles 17. Excluding the בֵּית in verse 14 for the time being, the meanings of the other 13 occurrences are clear: palace (vv. 1a, 1b), Temple (vv. 4, 5, 6, 12), and dynasty (vv. 10, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 27).

McKenzie argues that the parallel structure of verse 14, ‘my house and my kingdom’ should lead us to understand בְּבֵיתִי as God’s dynasty.<sup>103</sup> McKenzie views

<sup>101</sup> Hereafter, English translations of the LXX follow NETS unless indicated

<sup>102</sup> Lemke, “Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler’s History,” 43.

<sup>103</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 158.

the structure of the phrase as tautological. From the phrase **בְּבֵיתִי וּבְמַלְכוּתִי**, Williamson claims that God is the real king of Israel, his kingdom.<sup>104</sup> Namely, ‘my house’ refers to God’s kingdom of Israel. Williamson bolsters his view with other passages in Chronicles:<sup>105</sup>

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:5)

Yours, O LORD, are the greatness, the power, the glory, the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heavens and on the earth is yours; yours is the kingdom, O LORD, and you are exalted as head above all. (1 Chr 29:11)

Then Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD, succeeding his father David as king; he prospered, and all Israel obeyed him. (1 Chr 29:23)

Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on his throne as king for the LORD your God. Because your God loved Israel and would establish them forever, he has made you king over them, that you may execute justice and righteousness. (2 Chr 9:8)

And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. (2 Chr 13:8)

Thus, for both McKenzie and Williamson, ‘my house’ does not mean the Temple but the kingdom of Israel, which is God’s dynasty. In this line of interpretation, God’s house is bigger than the Temple. God’s house has been extended to the kingdom of Israel.

However, textual evidence does not support this expanded interpretation of ‘God’s house’. As we examined in 1 Chronicles 17 the other four occurrences of God’s **בַּיִת** (vv. 4, 5, 6, 12) designate the Temple of God. We need to examine more closely the book of Chronicles to ascertain if **בַּיִת** is ever used to designate the

---

<sup>104</sup> H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCB (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 136.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

kingdom of Israel. The following is the examination of the 325 occurrences of **בֵּית** in Chronicles.

The 325 uses of **בֵּית** in Chronicles occur in a variety of contexts. Upon examination, it is observed that 324 occurrences (except for 1 Chr 17:14) of **בֵּית** fall into 14 distinct groups: the Temple of YHWH, clan, palace, dynasty, house, family, Temple of other gods, room, storehouse, home, inside, factory, tabernacle, prison.

Usage (324)	Reference
Temple of YHWH (207)	1 Chronicles
	5:36 (6:10)
	6:16 (31), 17 (32), 33 (48)
	9:11, 13, 23a, 26, 27
	17:4, 5, 6, 12
	22:1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 19
	23:4, 24b, 28a, 28b, 32
	24:19
	25:6a, 6b
	26:12, 20, 22, 27
	28:2, 3, 6, 10, 12a, 12b, 13a, 13b, 20, 21
	29:2, 3a, 3b, 3c, 7, 8, 16
	2 Chronicles
	1:18a (2:1a)
	2: 3 (4), 4 (5), 5a (6a), 5b (6b), 8 (9), 11a (12a)
	3:1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8b, 11, 12, 15
	4:11, 16, 19, 22a, 22b
	5:1a 1b, 7, 13a, 13b, 14
	6:2, 5, 7, 8, 9a, 9b, 10, 18, 20, 22, 24, 29, 32, 33, 34, 38
	7:1, 2a, 2b, 3, 5, 7, 11a, 11c, 12, 16, 20, 21a, 21b
	8:1a, 16a, 16b
	9:4, 11a
	12:9a, 11
	15:18
	16:2a
	20:5, 9a, 9b, 28
	22:12
	23:3, 5b, 6, 7, 9, 10a, 10b, 10c, 12, 14b, 18a, 18b, 19, 20a
	24:4, 5, 7a, 7b, 8, 12a, 12b, 12c, 13, 14a, 14b, 16, 18, 21, 27
	25:24a
	26:19, 21b
	27:3
	28:21a, 24a, 24b, 24c
	29:3, 5, 15, 16a, 16b, 17, 18, 20, 25, 31, 35
	30:1, 15
	31:10b, 11, 13, 16, 21

	33:4, 5, 7a, 7b, 15a, 15b 34:8a, 8b, 9, 10a, 10b, 10c, 14, 15, 17, 30a, 30b 35:2, 3, 8, 20 36:7, 10, 14, 17, 18a, 18b, 19, 23
Clan (40)	1 Chronicles 2:55 4:38 5:13, 15, 24a, 24b 7:2, 4, 7, 9, 40 9:9, 13a, 19 12:29 (28), 31 (30) 21:17 23:11, 24a 24:4a, 4b, 6, 30 26:6, 13 28:4a, 4b, 4c  2 Chronicles 10:16 11:1 17:14 19:11 22: 10 25:5, 31:10a, 17 35:4, 5a, 5b, 12
Palace (26)	1 Chronicles 14:1 17:1a, 1c  2 Chronicles 1:18b (2:1b) 2: 2 (3), 11b (12b) 7:11b, 11d 8:1b, 11b 9:3, 11b 12:9b, 10 16:2b 19:1 21:17 23:5a, 15, 20b 25:24b 26:21c 28:7, 21b 33:20, 24
Dynasty (19)	1 Chronicles 12:30 (29) 17:10, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 27  2 Chronicles



	10:19 21:6, 7, 13a, 13b 22:3, 4, 7, 8, 9 35:21
House (6)	1 Chronicles 13:7, 13, 14b 15:25  2 Chronicles 8:11a 26:21a
Family (5)	1 Chronicles 7:23 10:6 13:14a, 14c 16:43b
Temple of other gods (4)	1 Chronicles 10:10a, 10b  2 Chronicles 23:17 32:21
Room (Nave) (4)	1 Chronicles 28:11  2 Chronicles 3:8a, 10, 13
Storehouse (4)	1 Chronicles 26:15  2 Chronicles 9:16 9:20 16:10
Home (4)	1 Chronicles 16:43a  2 Chronicles 11:4 18:16 25:19
Inside (2)	2 Chronicles 4:4 23:14a
Factory (1)	1 Chronicles 4:21
Tabernacle (1)	1 Chronicles 9:23b
Prison (1)	2 Chronicles

The above survey of בֵּית betrays that of the 324 other occurrences, there is not a single use of בֵּית that refers to the kingdom of Israel. This fact strongly suggests that it is highly unlikely that the בֵּית in 1 Chr 17:14 means the expanded house of God, the kingdom of Israel.

In my view, the passages cited by Williamson (1 Chr 28:5; 29:11, 23; 2 Chr 9:8; 13:8) evidence YHWH's lordship over Israel; the real king of Israel is YHWH. This phrase corresponds well to וּבְמַלְכוּתִי ('and my kingdom') of 1 Chr 17:14. However, it is highly problematic to connect the cited passages to בְּבֵיתִי ('in my house'). In fact, 'YHWH's בֵּית' does not occur in the cited passages at all. YHWH's lordship over Israel is indicated by the phrases '(YHWH's) kingdom' and '(YHWH's) throne'.

McKenzie's point about the parallel structure of 'my house and my kingdom' is insufficient to show that 'my house' refers to the kingdom of Israel. McKenzie does not explain why the parallel structure is to be understood tautologically. In the parallel structure, it is not necessary that the first word is semantically limited or defined by the second word. Thus, as with the other occurrences of God's בֵּית in 1 Chronicles 17, it is most appropriate to understand בְּבֵיתִי in 1 Chr 17:14 as 'in the Temple of God'.

Then, what is the meaning of the following clause in 1 Chr 17:14?

וְהָעֲמַדְתִּיהוּ בְּבֵיתִי וּבְמַלְכוּתִי

And I will establish him in my house and in my kingdom

Since the interpretation of בְּבֵיתִי is the key for this investigation, let us first examine the use of the preposition בְּ particularly with בֵּית. 'בבית' occurs 40 times with various prefixes and suffixes in the book of Chronicles: בבית(31), בביתו(4), בביתי(1), בביתך(1), ובבית(2), ובביתו(1). The following chart highlights the 40 uses of 'בבית' in Chronicles.

Reference	Use of ב
1 Chronicles	
5:36 (6:10)	In
7:23	In
13:14	In
17:1a, 1b, 5, 14	In, ? (14)
21:17	In
26:12	In
28:4	In
29:3	In
2 Chronicles	
3:10	In
4:11	In
6:22, 24	In
7:11a, 11b	In
8:11	In
9:16	In
10:19	Against
20:5, 9	In
22:12	In
23:3, 5	In
24:14	In
25:19, 24	In
26:19	In
31:11	In
33:4, 7a, 7b, 24	In
34:10a, 10b, 15, 17	In
35:3	In
36:17	In

As the examination of the use of ב with בֵּית shows, out of the 40 times ב occurs with בֵּית, 38 uses concern spatiality with the sense of ‘in’, and once in the sense of an adversative ‘against’. The preposition ב with בֵּית of 1 Chr 17:14 is our concern here. The outcome of the examination indicates that the use of ב with בֵּית in Chronicles does not exhibit much variation, and the dominant use of ב with בֵּית is spatial. Since there is no idiosyncratic use of ב with בֵּית discovered in Chronicles, and it is most natural to apply the spatial use ‘in’ for the ב with בֵּית in the context of 1 Chr 17:14, the most appropriate translation of בְּבֵיתִי is ‘in my house’, which is ‘in the Temple of God’.

If the בְּבֵיתִי is rendered as ‘in the Temple of God’, we can rephrase the sentence of 1 Chr 17:14:

‘And I shall establish him in the Temple and in my kingdom’.

Since the third suffix is clearly Solomon, we can apply this sentence to the scene of Solomon’s coronation in 1 Chr 29:21-25:

On the next day they offered sacrifices and burnt offerings to the LORD, a thousand bulls, a thousand rams, and a thousand lambs, with their libations, and sacrifices in abundance for all Israel; and they ate and drank before the LORD on that day with great joy. They made David’s son Solomon king a second time; they anointed him as the LORD’s prince, and Zadok as priest. Then Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD, succeeding his father David as king; he prospered, and all Israel obeyed him. All the leaders and the mighty warriors, and also all the sons of King David, pledged their allegiance to King Solomon. The LORD highly exalted Solomon in the sight of all Israel, and bestowed upon him such royal majesty as had not been on any king before him in Israel. (1 Chr 29:21-25)

In 1 Chr 29:22, though there is שְׁנִיית (‘second time’) in the MT, some other texts (e.g., LXX<sup>B</sup>) omit שְׁנִיית. Whether this is the first or second coronation feast cannot be decided; it takes place in any case before Solomon’s building of the Temple.<sup>106</sup> Simply because there was no Temple building yet, it is not possible to apply the clause, ‘And I shall establish him in the Temple’, into the scene of Solomon’s coronation.

Schniedewind makes an attempt to specify the meaning of the clause:

The meaning of ‘my house and my kingdom’ (בביתי ובמלכותי) is amply clear when the Chronicler reuses this language to refer to Solomon’s temple and palace. In 2 Chr 1:18, we are told that Solomon resolved to build ‘a house for the name of YHWH and a house for his kingdom’ (בית לשם יהוה ובית למלכותו). In 2 Chr 2:11, Hiram praises Solomon who has the wisdom to build ‘a house for YHWH and a house for his kingdom’ (בית ליהוה ובית למלכותו). This pairing of the house of God and the house of the kingdom, that is the temple

---

<sup>106</sup> It is possible that the Chronicler omits the first coronation, which is described in 1 Kgs 1:32-36.

and the palace, relies on the Chronicler's version of the Dynastic Oracle in 1 Chr 17:14...<sup>107</sup>

Schniedewind draws on 2 Chr 1:18 (2:1) and 2:11 (12) for the interpretation of the phrase in 1 Chr 17:14. By relying on the two passages, 2 Chr 1:18 (2:1) and 2:11 (12), he interprets the phrase, 'in my house and my kingdom' as 'in the Temple and the palace'. However, his connection of these two passages to the phrase in 1 Chr 17:14 is problematic when we notice that **וּבַמְּלָכוֹתִי** ('and in my kingdom') of 1 Chr 17:14 is different from **וּבֵית לַמְּלָכוֹת** ('and the house of his kingdom') of the two 2 Chronicles phrases. **וּבֵית לַמְּלָכוֹת** of the two 2 Chronicles passages means 'the palace' as Schniedewind says, but **וּבַמְּלָכוֹתִי** of the 1 Chr 17:14 does not mean 'the palace'. **מַלְכוּת** is a Late Biblical Hebrew word, which means 'dominion', 'kingdom', or 'kingship'.<sup>108</sup>

As Knoppers avers, it is most appropriate to interpret the phrase **וְהָעֵמֻדֶיהֶוָּ** **בְּבֵיתִי** as an indication of a special tie between the Temple and David's heir.<sup>109</sup>

Through the book of Chronicles the kings of the Davidic dynasty play important roles in the Temple. Not only does the Chronicler describe David and Solomon as the preparer and completer of the Temple building project, but the kings of the Davidic dynasty appoint and assemble Temple personnel for various roles such as priests, singers, gatekeepers, and treasurers (e.g., 1 Chronicles 23-26; 2 Chr 29:4), provide offerings (e.g., 2 Chr 30:24; 35:7), and repair the Temple (e.g., 2 Chr 24:4-5; 29:3).

Nevertheless this special tie between the Temple and David's heir should not be understood as tantamount to the king's right to exercise full priestly duty. The Chronicler confirms the exclusive privilege of Aaronic descendants in cultic officiation (1 Chr 6:33-34 (48-49), 2 Chr 13:10-11) and offers no exception to the rule. Though the kings of Judah take important roles in the house of YHWH in Chronicles, it does not mean that kings can do everything that priests do. A good illustration of this is God's punishment for Uzziah's involvement in the priestly role:

---

<sup>107</sup> William M. Schniedewind, "King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism," *JJS* 45 (1994), 73.

<sup>108</sup> Nel, "מלך," 957-958.

<sup>109</sup> Gary Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10-29*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 672-673.

But when he had become strong he grew proud, to his destruction. For he was false to the LORD his God, and entered the temple of the LORD to make offering on the altar of incense. <sup>17</sup> But the priest Azariah went in after him, with eighty priests of the LORD who were men of valor; <sup>18</sup> they withstood King Uzziah, and said to him, ‘It is not for you, Uzziah, to make offering to the LORD, but for the priests the descendants of Aaron, who are consecrated to make offering. Go out of the sanctuary; for you have done wrong, and it will bring you no honor from the LORD God’. <sup>19</sup> Then Uzziah was angry. Now he had a censer in his hand to make offering, and when he became angry with the priests a leprous disease broke out on his forehead, in the presence of the priests in the house of the LORD, by the altar of incense. (2 Chr 26:16-19)

Here, God punishes King Uzziah for usurping the priestly function by burning incense in the Temple. There is an apparent description of the king’s violation of cultic holiness, when the reader is told that ‘he had a censer in his hand to make offering’ (v. 19).

Regarding the king’s role in the offering, the details in 1 Chr 29:20-35 are helpful:

Then King Hezekiah rose early, assembled the officials of the city, and went up to the house of the LORD. <sup>21</sup> They brought seven bulls, seven rams, seven lambs, and seven male goats for a sin offering for the kingdom and for the sanctuary and for Judah. He commanded the priests the descendants of Aaron to offer them on the altar of the LORD. <sup>22</sup> So they slaughtered the bulls, and the priests received the blood and dashed it against the altar... (2 Chr 29:20-35)

As v. 21 shows, the king’s role in the offerings was not to perform the cultic function but to order priests to carry out the cultic work: ‘He commanded the priests to offer sacrifices on the altar of the Lord’.

To explicate the intriguing phrase **וְהָעֲמֻדָּתִיהוּ בְּבֵיתִי**, 2 Chr 31:21 supplies an important clue:

וּבְכָל-מַעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר-הָחֵל בְּעִבְדוֹת בֵּית-הָאֱלֹהִים וּבַתּוֹרָה  
וּבַמִּצְוָה לְדָרֵשׁ לֵאלֹהֵיוּ בְכָל-לִבָּבוֹ עָשָׂה וְהִצְלִיחַ

And every work that he undertook *in the service of the house of God*, and in accordance with the law and the commandments, to seek his God, he did with all his heart; and he prospered.

Hezekiah undertook every work בַּעֲבוֹדַת בֵּית־הָאֱלֹהִים ('in the service of the house of God'). The phrase בַּעֲבוֹדַת בֵּית־הָאֱלֹהִים may be an expanded form of בְּבֵיתִי of 1 Chr 17:14.

Consequently the clause, וְהָעִמְדָתִיהוּ בְּבֵיתִי וּבַמִּלְכוּתִי of 1 Chr 17:14 is to be interpreted as: 'And I shall establish him in the service of the Temple of God and in the kingdom of Israel'. God establishes Solomon as the supervisor of the Temple service. If the Levites carry the specific jobs of the Temple such as priests, singers, gatekeepers and treasurers, King Solomon takes the responsibility for supervision of the Temple. In this interpretation, בְּבֵיתִי ('in the Temple of God') of 1 Chr 17:14 would not serve to weaken the Davidic covenant by pointing to the influence of the Temple and its cultus. On the contrary, the Davidic kings play an important role in the service of the Temple and the centrality of the Davidic dynasty is enhanced.

## 2. 5. 2 Sam 7:20//1 Chr 17:18

A comparison between 1 Chr 17:18 and its corresponding passage in 2 Sam 7:20 discloses the Chronicler's conviction regarding David's significance:

וְמַה־יּוֹסִיף עוֹד דָּוִד לְדַבֵּר אֵלַיךָ וְאַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ  
And what more can David say to you? For you know your servant  
(2 Sam 7:20)

מַה־יּוֹסִיף עוֹד דָּוִד אֵלַיךָ לְכַבֹּד אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ וְאַתָּה  
אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ יָדַעְתָּ  
And what more can David add to you for honoring your servant? You  
know your servant. (1 Chr 17:18, my translation)

There are two notable differences. First, the phrase, לְכַבֹּד אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ, occurs only in 1 Chr 17:18. This phrase emphasizes the honour of David and his kingdom. By mentioning David as YHWH's עַבְדִּי again, the Chronicler reminds the reader of

David's privilege. In the Old Testament, the dominant recipients of the honorary title, YHWH's עֶבֶד, are Moses and David, 37 times and 38 times respectively.<sup>110</sup> Klein observes that while YHWH's עֶבֶד applies to Moses, Joshua, and David in the Deuteronomistic history, the Chronicler uses the title only for David.<sup>111</sup> In Chronicles, even Solomon, the one who completes the Temple, does not receive the title. Second, the Chronicler places the object, אֶת־עֶבְדִּי, before the predicate יָדַעַת in the second clause. Considering the natural 'verb-object' word order of Hebrew, this reversal highlights the Chronicler's emphasis of David as YHWH's servant.<sup>112</sup>

### 3. Further Issues

#### 3. 1. Ideology for the revival of the Davidic dynasty

The text of 1 Chronicles 17 upholds in the Davidic covenant the revival of the Davidic kingdom as the following arguments support. The arguments here concern those issues not already addressed in the synoptic comparison above.

##### 3. 1. 1. עולם

In 1 Chronicles 17 עולם occurs 8 times with the two propositions, עַד (vv. 12, 14 (x2), 22, 23, 24) and לְ (v. 27 (x2)) as it does in the synoptic text of 2 Samuel 7 (vv. 13, 16 (x2), 24, 25, 26, 29 (x2)). Though עולם occurs 8 times in 2 Samuel 7 and the same number of times in its parallel section, 1 Chronicles 17, the 8 occurrences of 1 Chronicles 17 have greater significance for the Chronicler's *Sitz im Leben*. Unlike 2 Samuel 7, which is generally viewed as preexilic, 1 Chronicles 17 was composed in the postexilic period when the Israelites were still under foreign power.<sup>113</sup> The issue is the sense of the phrases עַד־עולם or לְעולם attached to the Davidic covenant, which are generally rendered as 'forever'. Was not the eternal

<sup>110</sup> Richard Schultz, "Servant, Slave," *NIDIOTT* IV, 1190-1191.

<sup>111</sup> Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 377. Moses as YHWH's עֶבֶד: Josh 1:2, 7; 2 Kgs 21:8, Joshua as YHWH's עֶבֶד: Josh 24:29, David as YHWH's עֶבֶד: 2 Sam 3:18; 7:5, 8; 1 Kgs 11:13, 32, 34, 36, 38; 14:8; 2 Kgs 19:34; 20:6.

<sup>112</sup> GKC § 142 f, 456.

<sup>113</sup> Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, 29.



Davidic covenant abrogated when Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon captured Jerusalem in 586 BC? Braun claims that the eight fold repetition of עוֹלָם in 1 Chronicles 17 denotes that the Davidic covenant is not abrogated nor is it necessary to be abrogated.<sup>114</sup> On the contrary, Pomykala reckons עוֹלָם in 1 Chronicles 17 as ‘remotest time’ rather than ‘everlasting’, and views the year 586 BC as the end of the remotest time.<sup>115</sup>

עוֹלָם probably derives from עָלַם (‘to conceal’) and the basic meaning of עוֹלָם is ‘obscure time’, ‘remotest time’, or ‘long time’.<sup>116</sup> The range of ‘remoteness’ or ‘long time’ varies in its context.<sup>117</sup> It could mean ‘for a great while’ (e.g., 1 Sam 1:22), or ‘eternity’ (e.g., Exod 15:18):<sup>118</sup>

But Hannah did not go up, for she said to her husband, ‘As soon as the child is weaned, I will bring him, that he may appear in the presence of the LORD, and remain there *forever* (עַד-עוֹלָם)’. (1 Sam 1:22)

The LORD will reign *forever and ever* (לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד). (Exod 15:18)

In 1 Sam 1:22, Hannah says to her husband that when Samuel is weaned, she will bring him to the tabernacle of the Lord and leave him there forever (עַד-עוֹלָם). Here, עַד-עוֹלָם means the lifespan rather than eternity. Exod 15:18 is the part of the Song of Moses, where Moses sings a song exalting the eternal reign of YHWH.

<sup>114</sup> Braun, *1 Chronicles*, 200.

<sup>115</sup> Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynastic Tradition in Early Judaism*, 96-97.

<sup>116</sup> BDB, 761; HALOT I, 798; Anthony Tomasino, “עוֹלָם,” *NIDOTTE* III, 345; E. Jenni, “עוֹלָם,” *THAT* II, 230.

<sup>117</sup> James Barr points out that ‘most important is to notice that in the sense “the remotest time” no specification is given of how remote the time referred to is; precisions of this kind may be inferred from the context.’ in *Biblical Words for Time* (London: SCM Press, 1969), 73; HALOT I, 798-799.

<sup>118</sup> For more examples of the wide temporal range of לְעוֹלָם in the Old Testament, see Lyle Eslinger, “Excursus: For ever or For awhile?,” *House of God or House of David* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 46-48.

To specify what the Chronicler means by עולם in the context of 1 Chronicles 17, Pomykala argues that one must look to another temporal phrase in 1 Chronicles 17, למרחוק in v. 17, which he translates as a reference to the future:

And even this was a small thing in your sight, O God; you have also spoken of your servant's house *for a great while to come* (למרחוק).

Pomykala contends that למרחוק, which does not mean 'eternal', or 'everlasting', but 'far off' in the other Old Testament texts, provides a time frame for specifying the meaning of עולם. It means 'for a great while to come' rather than 'eternal'.

However, an examination of the occurrences of למרחוק in the Old Testament questions Pomykala's contention. למרחוק occurs 8 times in the Old Testament: 2 Sam 7:19; 2 Kgs 19:25; 1 Chr 17:17; 2 Chr 26:15; Ezra 3:13; Job 36:3; 39:29; Isa 37:26. Among them only half of the occurrences carry temporal sense (2 Sam 7:19; 2 Kgs 19:25; 1 Chr 17:17; Isa 37:26) and the others carry spatial sense. Since 2 Kgs 19:25 parallels Isa 37:26, and 2 Sam 7:19 parallels 1 Chr 17:17, there are really only two examples of temporal use of למרחוק in the Old Testament: למרחוק in 2 Sam 7:19/1 Chr 17:17 and 2 Kgs 19:25/Isa 37:26. 2 Kgs 19:25 reads:<sup>119</sup>

Have you not heard that I determined it *long ago* (למרחוק)? I planned from days of old what now I bring to pass, that you should make fortified cities crash into heaps of ruins.

This is part of God's word against Sennacherib through the mouth of Isaiah. Concerning Sennacherib's arrogance for his victories over the other nations, God says that Sennacherib's victories are under God's ordained plan. Here, למרחוק is used in a temporal sense looking to the distant past, 'long ago' rather than distant future.

While there are only 8 incidents of למרחוק in the Old Testament, מרחוק without the lamed occurs 23 times and may shed more light on the meaning of the

---

<sup>119</sup> There is no difference between the two passages of 2 Kgs 19:25 and Isa 37:26 concerning the use of למרחוק.

temporal use of לְמִרְחוֹק.<sup>120</sup> Among them the most common use of מִרְחוֹק is spatial, basically meaning ‘from a far distant place’. Only 3 passages use it in the temporal sense: Isa 22:11; 25:1; Jer 31:3:

You made a reservoir between the two walls for the water of the old pool. But you did not look to him who did it, or have regard for him who planned it *long ago* (מִרְחוֹק). (Isa 22:11)

O LORD, you are my God; I will exalt you, I will praise your name; for you have done wonderful things, plans formed *of old* (מִרְחוֹק), faithful and sure. (Isa 25:1)

The Lord has appeared to me *long ago* (מִרְחוֹק) ‘I have loved you with everlasting love, therefore I have drawn you with loving-kindness’. (Jer 31:3, my translation)

Isa 22:11 speaks of God’s condemnation of the Israelites, who look at the old reservoir without looking at God, the maker of it long ago, while Isa 25:1 praises the Lord whose works and counsels have been wonderful from the past. Jer 31: 3 is a part of God’s word of restoration for Israel. From the above examination of מִרְחוֹק, every occurrence of temporal מִרְחוֹק in the Old Testament concerns a long time *before* the present rather than a long time *from* the present.

In sum, since the other occurrences of the temporal phrase לְמִרְחוֹק other than 2 Sam 7:19/1 Chr 17:17 and all the occurrences of the temporal phrase מִרְחוֹק in the Old Testament direct towards the past, it is adequate to translate לְמִרְחוֹק of 1 Chr 17:17 as ‘long ago’ rather than ‘long ahead’. Thus מִרְחוֹק in 1 Chr 17:17 is not able to serve as the time frame of the futuristic use of עוֹלָם in 1 Chronicles 17. Furthermore, the meaning of ‘long ago’ fits well in the context of David’s responsive prayer to God. The second clause of 1 Chr 17:17, וַתִּדְבֹר עַל-בֵּית-עַבְדְּךָ לְמִרְחוֹק (You have spoken about the house of your servant long ago) is David’s response to God’s speech about the early history of Israel from which the Davidic house originated, and God’s election of David and his prosperity:

<sup>120</sup> Deut 28:49; 2 Kgs 2:7; Neh 12:43; Job 2:12; 36:25; Ps 139:2; Prov 7:19; Isa 5:26; 22:3, 11; 23:7; 25:1; 43:6; 49:1, 12; 59:14; 60:4, 9; Jer 30:10; 31:3; 46:27; 51:50; Hab 1:8

For I have not lived in a house since the day I brought out Israel to this very day, but I have lived in a tent and a tabernacle. Wherever I have moved about among all Israel, did I ever speak a word with any of the judges of Israel, whom I commanded to shepherd my people, saying, why have you not built me a house of cedar? Now therefore thus you shall say to my servant David: Thus says the LORD of hosts: I took you from the pasture, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people Israel; and I have been with you wherever you went, and have cut off all your enemies before you. (1 Chr 17:5 – 8b)

In this sense, though most translations of the Bible (e.g., NRSV, NKJV, NJPS, NASV, NJB) and most commentators renders לְמִרְחֹק of 1 Chr 17:17 in a future sense, I agree with Knoppers in translating it as ‘from a long time ago’.<sup>121</sup>

The question remains: does עוֹלָם of 1 Chronicles 17 mean ‘eternal’ or ‘far off’? A clue can be found in the uncompromising nature of 1 Chr 17:13:

וְחֶסְדִּי לֹא־אֶסִּיר מֵעַמּוֹ כִּאֲשֶׁר הִסִּירוּתִי מֵאִשָּׁר הָיָה לְפָנָיִךְ  
 And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him  
 who was before you. (my translation)

God expresses his intention using the strongest negative particle לֹא with an imperfect verb form, אֶסִּיר.<sup>122</sup> YHWH solemnly declares the continuation of his steadfast love for the Davidic house by contrasting it to the cessation of his חֶסֶד given to Saul. In this proclamation there is no hint that YHWH grants his חֶסֶד to the Davidic house for a while and removes it at some point in the future. Unlike the house of Saul, God promises the Davidic house unceasing, perpetual חֶסֶד and this firm promise renders עוֹלָם ‘eternal’ rather than ‘far off’.

Another clue revealing the specific range of עוֹלָם in the Davidic covenant is the Chronicler’s use of עוֹלָם within the narrative unit of 1 Chronicles 17. Out of the eight occurrences of עוֹלָם in 1 Chronicles 17, six are attached to the Davidic throne (vv. 12, 14), the Davidic kingdom (v.14 - the Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom),

<sup>121</sup> Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10-29*, 677. Most commentators translate לְמִרְחֹק futuristically: Myers, *1 Chronicles*, 128; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 325; Braun, *1 Chronicles*, 196; Thompson, *1, 2 Chronicles*, 148; Johnstone *1 & 2 Chronicles I*, 207, etc.

<sup>122</sup> GKC § 107 O, 317.

the Davidic house (v. 27 (x2)), and the Davidic covenant (v. 23), all of which are significant to the עוֹלָם of the Davidic covenant:

- v. 12 - I will establish his *throne forever*.
- v. 14 - I will confirm him in my *kingdom forever* and his *throne* shall be established *forever*.
- v. 23 - O Lord, as for the word that you have spoken concerning your servant and concerning his house, let *it* (the Davidic covenant) be established *forever*.
- v. 27 - *The house* of your servant, that it may continue *forever* before you. For you, O LORD, have blessed (it) and *it* is blessed *forever*.

The other two occurrences appear in vv. 22 and 24 referring respectively to the עוֹלָם of Israel as YHWH's chosen people, and the firmness and greatness of YHWH's name:

- v. 22 - You have made *your people Israel* your very own people *forever*.
- v. 24 - *Your name* will be *established and magnified forever*.

It is our interest here to specify the range of עוֹלָם in association with the Davidic covenant through these two occurrences of עוֹלָם. These are not directly connected to the dynastic promise but occur in the same context as Nathan's oracle concerning the Davidic house and David's prayerful response. Unlike לְמַדְּחוֹק of 1 Chr 17:17, which turns out to be inappropriate for providing the time frame of עוֹלָם with regard to the Davidic covenant, the two occurrences of עוֹלָם in vv. 22 and 24 support the specific range of the עוֹלָם of the Davidic covenant as perpetual. God's appointment of Israel as his own people in v 22 is the unending destiny for Israel; it is not a 'how long' issue since it is a perpetual relationship. Even in the midst of Israel's evil and rebellion against God, he would not forsake Israel as his people. Samuel indicates as much:

For the LORD will not cast away his people, for his great name's sake, because it has pleased the LORD to make you (Israel) a people for himself. (1 Sam 12:22)

The עולם of v. 24 in the context of praising YHWH's name signifies eternity as well. When עולם is attached to God or something belonging to God such as his name (e.g., Exod 3:15; 2 Kgs 21:7; 1 Chr 17:24; 2 Chr 7:16; 33:4, 7; Isa 63:12, 19; Ps 113:2; 135:13), his word (e.g., Isa 40:8), his glory (e.g., Ps 104:31), his power (e.g., Ps 66:7), and his loving-kindness (רַחֲמֵי, e.g., Ps 89:3 (2)), it tends to refer to eternity.<sup>123</sup> Thus, for example, we read in Psalm 90:2:<sup>124</sup>

Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever you had formed the earth and the world, *from everlasting to everlasting you are God* (וַיִּמְעוֹלָם עַד-עוֹלָם אֲתָהּ אֵל).

If the two instances of עולם (vv 22, 24), apart from the other six uses of עולם associated with the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17, convey 'perpetuity', the eternal sense of עולם with reference to the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 gains support.

The Chronicler's understanding of עולם as 'eternal' in his postexilic context when the Davidic dynasty had ceased to exist sheds light on his understanding of the nature of the Davidic covenant. For the Chronicler, the Babylonian exile does not signify the end of the Davidic dynasty; rather, he believes in the revival of the Davidic dynasty based on the perpetual promise made by God to David. The period of the exile and the loss of the Davidic dynasty is God's discipline against the unfaithful Davidic house and the Israelites, yet it does not mean the failure of the everlasting Davidic covenant. If the Chronicler regards the destruction of the Judaic kingdom by Babylon in 586 BC and the cessation of the Davidic throne as the failure of God's royal promise to the Davidic house, he would have excluded the Davidic covenant of 1 Chronicles 17 or radically emended Nathan's oracle. The Chronicler's faithful preservation of the Davidic covenant suggests that the perpetual dynastic promise

<sup>123</sup> H. Wheeler Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 114; Gershon Brin, *The Concept of the Time in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 102-103; *HALOT* I, 799.

<sup>124</sup> John Marsh, *The Fullness of Time* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), 29; Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, 114.

could include the dynastic lacuna and the dynastic lacuna shall be overcome on the ground of God's unfailing **רַחֲמָנָּה** towards the Davidic house.

### 3. 1. 2. The Davidic kingdom as YHWH's kingdom

As seen in the synoptic comparison, the Chronicler's designation of the Davidic kingdom as YHWH's kingdom in 1 Chr 17:14 is markedly different from its parallel verse in 2 Sam 7:16:

Your house and *your kingdom* shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever. (2 Sam 7:16)

But I will confirm him in my house and in *my kingdom* forever, and his throne shall be established forever. (1 Chr 17:14)

The Chronicler's designation of the Davidic kingdom as YHWH's kingdom in Nathan's oracles is not by accident but by intention. Besides 1 Chr 17:14, the clear equation of the Davidic kingdom (or throne) with the kingdom (or throne) of YHWH occurs in 1 Chr 28:5; 29:23; 2 Chr 9:8 and 2 Chr 13:8:

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon *the throne of the kingdom of the LORD* over Israel. (1 Chr 28:5)

Then Solomon sat on *the throne of the LORD*, succeeding his father David as king; he prospered, and all Israel obeyed him. (1 Chr 29:23)

Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on *his throne* as king for the LORD your God. Because your God loved Israel and would establish them forever, he has made you king over them, that you may execute justice and righteousness. (2 Chr 9:8)

And now you think that you can withstand *the kingdom of the LORD* in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. (2 Chr 13:8)

1 Chr 28:5 forms part of David's final instruction to the assembly of Israel and 1 Chr 29:23 illustrates Solomon's accession to the throne. 2 Chr 9:8 is part of the compliment of the queen of Sheba to Solomon and 2 Chr 13:8 is a portion of the

speech of the Judahite king, Abijah, against Jeroboam and northern Israelites. Out of these four passages, 1 Chr 28:5 and 2 Chr 13:8 lack a synoptic parallel while 1 Chr 29:23 and 2 Chr 9:8 parallel with 1 Kgs 2:12 and 1 Kgs 10:9 respectively. Comparing the Chronicler's two synoptic passages with the two passages from Kings, we notice that the designation of the Davidic kingdom (or throne) as the kingdom (or throne) of YHWH is the Chronicler's own contribution:

So Solomon sat on *the throne of his father David*; and his kingdom was firmly established. (1 Kgs 2:12)

Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on *the throne of Israel*! Because the LORD loved Israel forever, he has made you king to execute justice and righteousness. (1 Kgs 10:9)

Whereas the Deuteronomist designates Solomon's accession as being to the throne of David (1 Kgs 2:12) and the throne of Israel (1 Kgs 10:9), the Chronicler identifies the throne as the kingdom of YHWH (1 Chr 29:23) and to YHWH (2 Chr 9:8). The Chronicler's deliberate equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH's kingdom implies a strong tie between the Davidic kingdom and YHWH. One might suggest that through this explicit equation, the Chronicler bestows divine authority and affection upon the Davidic kingdom more than the Deuteronomist does.

Becker contends that the Chronicler's alteration of 2 Sam 7:16 in 1 Chr 17:14 bespeaks the Chronicler's disinterest in the revival of the Davidic kingship.<sup>125</sup> According to Becker, the Chronicler speaks of the kingship as YHWH's rather than being tied to David and Solomon, the earthly representatives.<sup>126</sup> Because the kingship is not David's but YHWH's, there is no need for the reestablishment of the 'Davidic' kingship in the Chronicler's theocratic society.<sup>127</sup> In other words, by changing the ownership of the monarchy, the Chronicler reveals his disinterest in the political

---

<sup>125</sup> Becker, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*, 81-82.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 81.



revival of David's regime in the cultic society in which YHWH maintains his kingship.

However, within the same oracle, the Chronicler does not seem to deprive David and Solomon of the ownership of kingship because the Chronicler still insists that the kingdom is for David and Solomon in 1 Chr 17:10-11:

Moreover I declare to you that the LORD will build *you* a house. When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and I will establish *his* kingdom. (1 Chr 17:10-11)

The kingdom is YHWH's in one place (1 Chr 17:14) and David's in the other (1 Chr 17:10-11). That is, the Chronicler does not suggest David and his descendant are mere participants in YHWH's kingdom but renders the Davidic kingdom as the kingdom of God. The Chronicler's equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH's kingdom does not refer to any change of ownership of the kingdom but rather is concerned with enhancing the Davidic kingdom as YHWH's kingdom.

Thus, the equation of the Davidic dynasty to YHWH's dynasty is noteworthy evidence, which is directly opposed to Rudolph's dismissal of the Davidic dynasty in Chronicles:

The failure of the Davidic dynasty could be borne, so long as the second pillar of the theocracy, the Jerusalem Temple, stood firm... The significance of the house of David for salvation was then limited to the fact that David and Solomon had created for the Temple those ordinances upon which the acceptable worship of the present community depended.<sup>128</sup>

Rudolph posits the Chronicler's strong support of the Temple and worshipping community when the Davidic dynasty no longer existed. Thus, according to Rudolph, the significance of the Davidic dynasty, for the Chronicler, severely diminishes and lies only in its establishment of the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus.

---

<sup>128</sup> Rudolph, "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," 409.

However, the Chronicler's equation of the Davidic dynasty as YHWH's dynasty speaks against the decreased significance of the Davidic dynasty; in fact, the Chronicler augments the importance of the Davidic dynasty through this equation. If the Chronicler considers the Davidic dynasty as expired and finds its role only in begetting the second pillar, the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus, he would not term the expired dynasty as YHWH's dynasty. As Knoppers points out, the Chronicler's association of the Davidic-Solomonic throne with the throne of YHWH and his repetition of the eternal dynastic promise for David's descendents connote the Chronicler's interest in the political as well as the cultic function of the Davidic dynasty.<sup>129</sup>

Certainly, the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus are important subjects for the Chronicler; he spends the bulk of Chronicles on Temple-related subjects such as the appointment of the Temple builder (1 Chr 17:4-14), the site of the Jerusalem Temple (1 Chr 21:18-22:1), the preparation for the Temple building (1 Chr 22:2-19), the Temple personnel: the Levites, the priests, the singers, the gatekeepers, the treasurers (1 Chr 23:1-26:28), David's instruction of the Temple building (1 Chr 28:1-29:9), and Solomon's preparation, completion, and dedication of the Temple building (2 Chr 1:18 (2:1)-7:22). However, that does not mean that the Jerusalem Temple totally absorbs Davidic royalism in Chronicles. Consequently, the Davidic dynasty cannot be reduced to a mere vehicle to give birth to the Temple and its cultus and then to expire. Rather, the Davidic dynasty itself is pivotal for the Chronicler, and he expresses his hope for the restoration of the temporarily ceased kingdom in his equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH's kingdom.

### 3. 1. 3. The Davidic covenant in David's prayer

The Chronicler addresses his interest in the Davidic dynasty in David's responsive prayer to Nathan's oracle in 1 Chr 17:16-27. There is no significant discrepancy between 1 Chr 17:16-27 and its parallel text, 2 Sam 7:18-29 with regard to the Davidic covenant. As the Deuteronomist highlights the Davidic covenant in

---

<sup>129</sup> Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10-29*, 673.

David's prayer, the Chronicler focuses on the eternal promise in spite of the nonexistence of the Davidic dynasty in the Chronicler's time. In David's response to Nathan's oracle, the Chronicler does not indicate the replacement of the Davidic dynasty with the Temple and its cultus in the postexilic age. Rather, David exclusively focuses on his dynasty without mentioning the Temple.<sup>130</sup> All six occurrences of **בֵּית** in this section refer to David's family/dynasty:

v. 16: Who am I, O LORD God, and what is *my house*, that you have brought me thus far?

v. 17: You have spoken about *the house of your servant* long ago. (my translation)

v. 23: O LORD, as for the word that you have spoken concerning your servant and concerning *his house*, let it be established forever, and do as you have promised.

v. 24: *The house of your servant David* will be established in your presence.

v. 25: For you, my God, have revealed to your servant that you will build *a house* for him.

v. 27: Therefore may it please you to bless *the house of your servant*.

In particular, it is remarkable that the Chronicler includes David's request for the fulfillment of the dynastic promise using imperative form, **וַעֲשֵׂה כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ** ('and do as you have promised!') as in the text of 2 Sam 7:25. If the Chronicler views the Davidic dynasty as an expired regime, he could have excluded David's strong demand of the fulfillment of the eternal dynastic promise. It sounds as if the Chronicler himself cries out to God for the revival of the Davidic dynasty in this demand for the fulfillment of the eternal covenant during this time when the Davidic dynasty does not exist.

### 3. 1. 4. Eschatological reading of the Davidic covenant

---

<sup>130</sup> Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 375.

The same statement can convey a different message depending on the time when the statement is read. When we inquire after the Chronicler's reading of the Davidic covenant in his post-Davidic dynasty period, it is possible to make two assumptions; first, the Chronicler could read the eternal Davidic covenant as something past rather than eternal, and thus reduce its import in his time. Secondly, he could revisit the perpetuity of the dynastic promise and hold the future hope of the Israelite Davidic kingdom by confirming the eternal dynastic promise upon David. 1 Chronicles 17, the key text to determining the Chronicler's view on the Davidic covenant, suggests the latter view. There is neither a hint of the Chronicler's perplexity over the non-existence of the Davidic kingdom nor any trace of the Chronicler's effort to reduce the import of the Davidic covenant in Nathan's oracle and David's responsive prayer. Certainly, the faithful preservation of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is contrasted with the Chronicler's radical elimination of the Mosaic-Sinai Covenant and the so-called Salvation History in Chronicles. When the Davidic covenant is read in light of the future hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingship, the promise remains relevant even in the post-dynasty period.

Keil contends that the Chronicler's alterations of 2 Samuel 7 reveals his hope for the Messiah from the seed of David.<sup>131</sup> He presents three alterations supporting his argument: the change from **אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֵיךָ** to **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ** in 1 Chr 17:11; the omission of this chastisement clause after 1 Chr 17:12; and the replacement of 'Your (David) house' and 'Your kingdom' with 'My (YHWH) house' and 'My kingdom' in 1 Chr 17:14.<sup>132</sup> Agreeing with Keil's messianic interpretation of 1 Chronicles 17, von Rad accepts the Chronicler's eschatological hope is manifested in 1 Chronicles 17.<sup>133</sup> However, as shown in the synoptic comparison, the difference between **אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֵיךָ** and **אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ** in 1 Chr 17:11 and the absence of the chastisement clause after 1 Chr 17:12 do not indicate the Chronicler's eschatological hope through the coming of the awaited Messiah.

<sup>131</sup> Keil, *The Books of the Chronicles*, 223-224.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 123-125.

Concerning the equation of the Davidic with YHWH's kingdom implies the Chronicler's hope for the revival of the Davidic dynasty, as already shown above. Yet the Chronicler's hope of the restoration of the kingdom indicated by YHWH's ownership of the Davidic kingdom does not refer to the coming of the Messiah in eschatological time. By referring to the Davidic kingdom as YHWH's kingdom, the Chronicler expresses a stronger tie between the Davidic dynasty and YHWH than the Deuteronomist, and by doing so, the Chronicler shows his longing for the Davidic kingdom. Yet, the text does not support or provide evidence for the implication that the revival of the Davidic dynasty is to be with the coming of the Messiah.

To investigate the eschatological aspect of the Davidic dynasty is intricate due to the fluidity in defining 'eschatology'. Japhet provides us with a helpful delineation of its concept in its narrow and broad sense:

Literally the word means 'the teaching of the last things' (τά ἔσχατα), which may be interpreted in a number of ways, and differences of definition are sometimes the source of controversy as to whether or not the Bible contains eschatology. Biblical scholarship has produced two main definitions – we may speak of 'eschatology in the narrow sense of the word' and 'eschatology in the broader sense'. 'Eschatology in the narrow sense' anticipates the annihilation of the existing world and the birth of a new world of everlasting salvation. It views the *eschaton* as something beyond history, beyond the time and space of the world as we know it. Very few biblical texts may be classified as eschatological in this sense, apart from primarily apocalyptic<sup>134</sup> passages such as Isaiah 24-27 and certain chapters in Daniel. Today, however, most scholars define eschatology in the broader sense of the word, characterizing the *eschaton* as the 'dawn of the age of salvation in the course of history.' According to this definition, eschatology envisions the creation of new and different world in the context of the existing world linked to time and history, to space and form. Nevertheless, the idea that the new world will be altogether different

---

<sup>134</sup> David Peterson sensibly explains conceptual differences between Apocalypticism and Eschatology: 'A related but by no means identical issue is the relationship between two conceptual terms eschatology and apocalypticism. At the outset it seems important to affirm that all apocalypticism involves eschatology, but not all eschatology involves apocalypticism. All apocalyptic literature in the Old Testament, which may be conveniently subdivided into early (e.g., Isaiah 24-27; Zechariah 9-14; Joel 3-4) and developed (Daniel 7-12), involves some notion of a momentous time during which Yahweh will act decisively to create a time of weal for Israel. Nonetheless, not all literature which has been labeled as eschatological shares the characteristics of this aforementioned apocalyptic literature, whether early or developed.' in "Eschatology (OT)," *ABD* II, 576.

from the world we know remains central to the definition of eschatology.<sup>135</sup>

If we consider the equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH's kingdom as eschatological, it is eschatological in the broader sense that the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty is a salvation to the Israelites in the course of history.

1 Chr 17:9 is another possible indicator of the Chronicler's eschatological hope for the Davidic dynasty:

וְשִׁמַּתִּי מָקוֹם לְעַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִטְעַתִּיהֶם וְשָׁכַן תַּחְתָּיו וְלֹא יִרְגָּז עוֹד וְלֹא־יִסִּיפוּ בְנֵי־עוֹלָה לְבַלְתּוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה  
I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, so that they may live in their own place, and be disturbed no more; and evildoers shall wear them down no more, as they did formerly. (1 Chr 17:9)

In the light of synoptic comparison between 1 Chr 17:9 and its parallel passage, 2 Sam 7:10, there is no conspicuous difference:

וְשִׁמַּתִּי מָקוֹם לְעַמִּי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִטְעַתִּיו וְשָׁכַן תַּחְתָּיו וְלֹא יִרְגָּז עוֹד וְלֹא־יִסִּיפוּ בְנֵי־עוֹלָה לְעַנּוֹתוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה  
And I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them, so that they may live in their own place, and be disturbed no more; and evildoers shall afflict them no more, as formerly. (2 Sam 7:10)

Textually, there are only three slight differences that do not convey any significant ideological variation: first, the repetitive preposition לְ before יִשְׂרָאֵל is wanting in Chronicles; secondly, while the Deuteronomist uses third person masculine suffix ך in וְנִטְעַתִּיו, the Chronicler takes another third person masculine suffix ךָ and finally, Chronicles has the *piel* form of בָּלָה ('to wear out') rather than עָנָה ('to afflict'). None of these reflect noteworthy semantic differences. Nevertheless, as Johnstone notes, the highly emotive terms of 1 Chr 17:9 in the context of the post-dynasty period

<sup>135</sup> Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, 499-500.

implies the Chronicler's eschatological hope for the realization of the Davidic covenant in the end time.<sup>136</sup>

God's promise of land and safety to the Israelites in 2 Sam 7:10//1 Chr 17:9 is realized in the Solomonic era:

See, a son shall be born to you; he shall be a man of peace. I will give him peace from all his enemies on every side; for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quiet to Israel in his days. (1 Chr 22:9)

Is not the LORD your God with you? Has he not given you peace on every side? For he has delivered the inhabitants of the land into my hand; and the land is subdued before the LORD and his people. (1 Chr 22:18)

However, the same promise does not signify the same notion for the Chronicler. God's promise of planting and protecting Israel in 1 Chr 17:9 seeks the revival of the lost Davidic dynasty.

There is an issue about the identification of the object of the verb **נָטַע**, which is the pronominal suffix **ו** in 2 Sam 7:10 and **הוּ** in 1 Chr 17:9. K. McCarter interprets **מָקוֹם** of 2 Sam 7:10 as a sacred place and views it as the object of **נָטַע**: 'I shall fix a place for my people Israel and plant it (a place), so that it will remain where it is and never again be disturbed'.<sup>137</sup> However, in terms of the relation between **מָקוֹם** and **וְנִטְעֵתִיו**, it is more plausible to have something to plant in the appointed place (**מָקוֹם**) than to plant 'the appointed place' itself. If it is difficult to find the antecedent of **ו**, **מָקוֹם** could be a possible candidate. Yet, there is no difficulty in finding the antecedent in the preceding word, **יִשְׂרָאֵל**:

וְשִׁמְתִּי מָקוֹם לְעַמִּי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִטְעֵתִיו וְשָׁכַן תַּחְתָּיו

<sup>136</sup> Johnstone, *I & 2 Chronicles* I, 204.

<sup>137</sup> P. Kyle McCarter, Jr. *II Samuel*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 190, 203.

People as the object of the verb נָטַע ('to plant') is not unfamiliar in biblical Hebrew. Besides 2 Sam 7:10 and 1 Chr 17:9, there are 8 passages in the Old Testament, where נָטַע is used metaphorically for the planting of people:

You brought them in and *planted* them on the mountain of your own possession, the place, O LORD, that you made your abode, the sanctuary, O LORD, that your hands have established. (Exod 15:17)

I will *plant* them upon their land, and they shall never again be plucked up out of the land that I have given them, says the LORD your God. (Amos 9:15)

The LORD of hosts, who *planted* you, has pronounced evil against you, because of the evil that the house of Israel and the house of Judah have done, provoking me to anger by making offerings to Baal. (Jer 11:17)

You *plant* them, and they take root; they grow and bring forth fruit; you are near in their mouths yet far from their hearts. (Jer 12:2)

I will set my eyes upon them for good, and I will bring them back to this land. I will build them up, and not tear them down; I will *plant* them, and not pluck them up. (Jer 24:6)

I will rejoice in doing good to them, and I will *plant* them in this land in faithfulness, with all my heart and all my soul. (Jer 32:41)

If you will only remain in this land, then I will build you up and not pull you down; I will *plant* you, and not pluck you up; for I am sorry for the disaster that I have brought upon you. (Jer 42:10)

You with your own hand drove out the nations, but them you *planted*; you afflicted the peoples, but them you set free. (Ps 44:3 (2))

It is remarkable that the 'planting people' metaphor refers to the restoration of Israel in half of the eight passages: Amos 9:15, Jer 24:6; 32:41; 42:10. These four passages suggest that the 'planting people' metaphor refers to the restoration of Israel when it is used with reference to the future. A similar feature between the planting image of 1 Chr 17:9 and the other four planting passages is the promise of future protection:

2 Chr 17:9: '...they may live in their own place, and be disturbed no more...'

Amos 9:15: '...they shall never again be plucked up out of the land...'



Jer 24:6: ‘... I will not pluck them up’

Jer 32:40: ‘...I will not turn away from doing them good...’

Jer 42:10: ‘... I will not pluck you up...’

In her study on the biblical imagery on the planting of man, Tikva Frymer-Kensky reports that:

The plant image is particularly important to describe God’s actions at the restoration. As the destruction was an uprooting and a razing, the restoration is a planting and a building... In the eschaton envisioned by Deutero-Isaiah, the people will all be righteous, inherit the land forever, and be the ‘branch of my planting, the work of my hands to glory in’ (Isa 60:21) and ‘righteous oaks, the plant of God to glory in’ (Isa 61:3).<sup>138</sup>

The Chronicler’s use of the ‘planting people’ metaphor in the post-dynasty context undergirds his longing for the restoration of Israel as seen in its other Old Testament uses.

### 3. 1. 5. The Chronicler’s faithful retention of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17

The Chronicler’s faithful preservation of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 works against the cultic interpretation of the dynastic promise. In agreement with 2 Samuel 7, God expresses his special love for David: He took David from the pasture to be a ruler over Israel (v. 7) and has been with him wherever he has gone (v. 8). Not only did God cut off all past enemies of David (v. 8), he will subdue all future enemies (v. 10). God will make David’s name like the names of the greatest men of the world (v. 8). God will provide a place for his people under David and he will plant them so that they will not be disturbed any more (v.9). God proclaims the establishment of the eternal Davidic kingdom (v.12) and his unfailing love for the

---

<sup>138</sup> Tikva Frymer-Kensky, “The Planting of Man: A Study in Biblical Imagery,” *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East.*, ed., John H. Marks and Robert M. Good (Connecticut: Four Quarters Publishing Company, 1987), 134-135.

Davidic house (v. 13). God even referred to the relationship between himself and David's son to be that of father and son (v. 13).

In David's responsive prayer, the Chronicler includes all the elements of God's blessing upon David and his eternal dynastic promise upon his family. David wonders at God's honouring of him as the most exalted of men (vv.17-18). David reiterates God's promise regarding the eternity of the Davidic dynasty, and David asks for the fulfillment of that promise (vv. 23-24). God is pleased to bless the Davidic house, and David requests eternal blessing of God upon his house (v. 27).

### 3. 2. Ideology against the revival of the Davidic dynasty

Now, let us consider the arguments against the revival of the Davidic dynasty in 1 Chronicles 17, which were not treated in the previous two sections.

#### 3. 2. 1. Solomon, not David, as the protagonist of the Chronicler

As examined in the synoptic comparisons, the chastisement clause of 2 Sam 7:14, ('When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings') is absent in 1 Chr 17:13, thereby promoting a flawless image of Solomon. According to Caquot, this absence is one instance where the Chronicler's idealizes Solomon over David.<sup>139</sup> Besides this absence, Caquot also enumerates the following points supporting the superiority of Solomon.

While bloodshed has made David unworthy to build the Temple, Solomon is a king of peace and wisdom. A king like Solomon would have been more attractive in the Greek period.<sup>140</sup> Moreover, Caquot also suggests that the lack of the Bathsheba narrative is not intended to conceal David's sin, but to prevent the reader from remembering Solomon as a son of adultery.<sup>141</sup> Caquot also points to the lack of reproach toward Solomon in Chronicles, which is different from the Deuteronomistic

---

<sup>139</sup> Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," 115-116.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., 116

<sup>141</sup> Ibid.

history.<sup>142</sup> The account of abandoning the law only begins in Chronicles with Rehoboam, rather than with Solomon as in 1 Kings 11.<sup>143</sup> Furthermore, if David prepares for the Temple building, Solomon is the one who built the Temple, and by the time of his completion of the Temple, the totality of the cult was realised.<sup>144</sup> Caquot also suggests that it is important to see Solomon as the unifier of the cultic legacies of Moses and David. In the Pentateuch, the ark is before the tent of meeting, whereas the Deuteronomistic history speaks of the ark exclusively; the Chronicler reconciles these two sources<sup>145</sup> David brought the ark, which had been returned from the Philistines, to Jerusalem. Concerning the tent, which is not an issue in the Deuteronomistic history, the Chronicler supposes that it has been deposited in the high place of Gibeon (1 Chr 21:29), thereby justifying the presence of Solomon in Gibeon for a sacrifice (1 Kgs 3:4) in 2 Chr 1:3.<sup>146</sup>

For the tabernacle of the LORD, which Moses had made in the wilderness, and the altar of burnt offering were at that time in the high place at Gibeon. (1 Chr 21:29)

The king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the principal high place; Solomon used to offer a thousand burnt offerings on that altar. (1 Kgs 3:4)

Then Solomon, and the whole assembly with him, went to the high place that was at Gibeon; for God's tent of meeting, which Moses the servant of the LORD had made in the wilderness, was there. (2 Chr 1:3)

Thus, the unification of the cultic legacies of Moses and David (i.e., the tent of meeting and the ark) takes place when Solomon completes the Temple building:<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

So they brought up the ark, the tent of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the tent; the priests and the Levites brought them up. (2 Chr 5:5)

For Caquot, the Chronicler's description of David is far from ideal in comparison to the idealized presentation of Solomon. The report of David's sin regarding the population census in 1 Chronicles 21 is harsher than that found in 2 Samuel 24.<sup>148</sup> Unlike the Deuteronomist's record, the Chronicler's presentation of David as a man of war seems to include the following judgment:

But the word of the LORD came to me, saying, 'You have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood in my sight on the earth'. (1 Chr 22:8)

This is part of Caquot's argument against Davidic messianism in Chronicles. Certainly, the change of the protagonist from David to Solomon weakens the Davidic eschatological messianism in Chronicles. By denying the Davidic messianism in Chronicles, Caquot argues that the Chronicler is satisfied with the hierocratic society and does not express hope for the reestablishment of the political Davidic kingdom of Israel.<sup>149</sup> Does the Chronicler render Solomon as the protagonist? Let us examine Caquot's arguments for Solomon's superior position over David in Chronicles.

### 3. 2. 1. 1. The lack of reproach towards Solomon

The lack of the chastisement clause in 1 Chr 17:13 certainly contributes to a rather impeccable image of Solomon but this does not necessarily suggest that Solomon occupies a greater position than David in the text of Chronicles. The place of the expected chastisement clause is within God's promise of the dynasty for David:

... I declare to you that the LORD will build *you* (אֲבָדְךָ) a house. When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 116.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 120.

your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. (*When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings.*) I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you. (1 Chr 17:10-13)

In the beginning of the dynastic promise, Nathan indicates that the promise is made for the sake of David (דָּוִד). God will raise offspring to succeed him and establish the kingdom of David's descendant *for David's sake*. In terms of the relationship between David and Solomon, the thrust of the promise suggests that God does good to David through David's son, Solomon, rather than suggesting that God bypasses David for Solomon.

Caquot points to the Chronicler's inclusion of David's census sin in 1 Chr 21:1-1 Chr 22:1, which is contrasted with his irreproachable portrait of Solomon.<sup>150</sup> Yet the Chronicler does not include the census event in order to lessen the portrait of David as compared to Solomon. Rather, the Chronicler includes David's census because it informs the reader how the Temple site was determined. David's census results in God's punishment upon Israel, and when David repents, the angel of God orders David to build an altar on the threshing floor of Araunah, the Jebusite, which is the future site for the Jerusalem Temple (1 Chr 22:1). Before David's preparations for the Temple building in 1 Chronicles 22-1 Chronicles 29, the Chronicler arranges the pericope of 1 Chr 21:1-1 Chr 22:1 to spell out how David determines the Temple site. David's sin is part of that narrative thread.

### 3. 2. 1. 2. The lack of the Bathsheba narrative

The Bathsheba narrative is absent from Chronicles. The hypothetical place for the Bathsheba narrative in Chronicles is between 1 Chr 20:1a and 1 Chr 20:1b as illustrated below:

---

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., 116

1 Chr 20:1a

In the spring of the year, the time when kings go out to battle, Joab led out the army, ravaged the country of the Ammonites, and came and besieged Rabbah. But David remained at Jerusalem.

(The Bathsheba narrative in 2 Sam 11:2-2 Sam 12:25)

1 Chr 20:1b

Joab attacked Rabbah, and overthrew it.

2 Sam 11:1

In the spring of the year, the time when kings go out to battle, David sent Joab with his officers and all Israel with him; they ravaged the Ammonites, and besieged Rabbah. But David remained at Jerusalem.

2 Sam 12:26

Now Joab fought against Rabbah of the Ammonites, and took the royal city.

Caquot claims that the Chronicler's omission of the conspicuous Bathsheba narrative of the Deuteronomistic history is not intended to conceal David's sin of adultery, but to prevent the reader from remembering Solomon as a son of adultery.<sup>151</sup> However, Solomon is not the outcome of the sin of adultery. The son of adultery between David and Bathsheba died as the punishment of God:

David said to Nathan, 'I have sinned against the LORD'. Nathan said to David, 'Now the LORD has put away your sin; you shall not die. Nevertheless, because by this deed you have utterly scorned the LORD, the child that is born to you shall die'. Then Nathan went to his house. The LORD struck the child that Uriah's wife bore to David, and it became very ill... On the seventh day the child died. (2 Sam 12:13-18)

Solomon is born after David has repented of his sin of adultery and received due punishment for the sin. Solomon is not the product of the adultery but God's blessing upon David, named יְדִידְיָהּ, 'beloved of YHWH':

Then David consoled his wife Bathsheba, and went to her, and lay with her; and she bore a son, and he named him Solomon. The LORD loved him, and sent a message by the prophet Nathan; so he named him Jedidiah, because of the LORD. (2 Sam 12:24-25)

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid.

Therefore, the Chronicler's removal of the Bathsheba narrative is not intended primarily to prevent readers from remembering Solomon as a son of adultery; rather, it attempts to exclude an indiscretion of David.

### 3. 2. 1. 3. The totality of the cult in the Solomonic period.

Caquot finds that Solomon occupies a superior position over David in Chronicles through the totality of the cult with the completion of the Temple building and the unification of the cultic legacies of Moses and David during the Solomonic era.<sup>152</sup> Caquot seems to consider the one who completes the Temple as greater than the one who prepares for the building project.

The Chronicler unequivocally informs us why David's role in the Temple building is limited to preparation in 1 Chr 22:8 and he repeats this in 1 Chr 28:3:

But the word of the LORD came to me, saying, 'You have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood in my sight on the earth'. (1 Chr 22:8)

But God said to me, 'You shall not build a house for my name, for you are a warrior and have shed blood'. (1 Chr 28:3)

The Chronicler reveals that David is not able to build the Temple because of the blood David shed in war. However, it is misleading to regard the Chronicler's disclosure of this reason as the Chronicler's condemnation of David. On the contrary, the Chronicler supplies a favourable statement about David immediately following each text:

*Behold a son, who shall be born for you!* (הַיְהִי־בֶן נֹלָד לָךְ) He shall be a man of peace. And I will give him rest from all his enemies on all around; for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quietness to Israel in his days. He shall build a house for my name. (1 Chr 22:9-10, my translation)

---

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., 117.

Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever... And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. He said to me, 'It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts'. (1 Chr 28:4-6)

It is noteworthy that encouraging words follow the reason for God's prohibition of David's Temple building. In 1 Chr 22:9, God encourages a disappointed David with an interjection particle, הִנֵּה בֶן נִלְדָּ לְךָ: הִנֵּה. God, who does not want David to be depressed by his disqualification from building the Temple, promises that one who shall be born from David shall undertake the project. God gives the objective reason for David's disqualification from the Temple project without judgment, and promises the completion of the project through David's own son.

Thus, Solomon is not a rival of David in any sense. Rather, God lets the son of David complete the Temple building for David's sake. If God prohibits David from the building project and grants this honor to another, who has little relation to David, then it is possible to say that God has higher regard for that individual than David. However, God does not set David and Solomon against one another. God allows the Davidic family to prepare for *and* complete the Temple building.

Likewise, God's election of David follows immediately after the reason for David's disqualification from the Temple building in 1 Chr 28:4, and he promises that David's son will take over the project: 'It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts'. (1 Chr 28:6)

Since God approves of David's wars and gave him victories in these wars, it is difficult to condemn David for his war-waging and bloodshed. For instance, the Chronicler records God's support for David's war in 1 Chr 14:10 and 1 Chr 18:6:

David inquired of God, 'Shall I go up against the Philistines? Will you give them into my hand?' The LORD said to him, "Go up, and I will give them into your hand'. (1 Chr 14:10)

The LORD gave victory to David wherever he went. (1 Chr 18:6)



The relationship between David and Solomon bears some analogy to that of Moses and Joshua.<sup>153</sup> As God does not allow Moses to enter the land of Canaan and lets Joshua take over Moses' leadership, God does not allow David to complete the Temple building project and lets David's son Solomon construct the Temple building. Just as Moses is not inferior to Joshua due to Moses' failure to enter Canaan, so is David not undervalued compared with Solomon in Chronicles. The reason for God's prohibition of David's building plans is a statement of fact rather than a statement of condemnation.<sup>154</sup>

Moreover, the Chronicler highlights the vital role played by the preparer of the Temple building project. The preparation was done by David, a man of maturity and experience:

For David said, 'My son Solomon is young and inexperienced, and the house that is to be built for the LORD must be exceedingly magnificent, famous and glorified throughout all lands; I will therefore make preparation for it'. So David provided materials in great quantity before his death. (1 Chr 22:5)

In addition to the Temple building, Caquot holds that Solomon's unification of the cultic legacies of Moses and David contributes to the realization of the totality of the cult.<sup>155</sup> Caquot considers the cultic legacy of Moses as the presence of both the ark and the tent of meeting, while the cultic legacy of David is the sole presence of the ark.<sup>156</sup> Although David carries the ark of the covenant from Baalah, which is Kiriath Jearim, through the house of Obed-Edom to Jerusalem (1 Chr 13, 15-16), the tent of meeting is left in Gibeon until Solomon's construction of the Temple. In Caquot's understanding, Solomon unifies the cultic legacy of Moses with that of David in the Temple as indicated in 2 Chr 5:5:

---

<sup>153</sup> Thompson, *1,2 Chronicles*, 165.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

<sup>155</sup> Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," 117.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

So they brought up the ark, the tent of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the tent; the priests and the Levites brought them up.

However, it is inequitable to attribute the realization of cultic unification more to Solomon than David. The unification of the ark and the tent of meeting requires both David and Solomon; David carries the ark of the covenant of God and Solomon builds the house of God, which replaces the tent of meeting. The unification happens in the Solomonic era, but David, as well as Solomon, played his part in this unification. Furthermore, it is not fitting to equate the unification of the ark and the tent of meeting with the unification of the cultic legacy of David and the cultic legacy of Moses. Since Moses' cultic legacy from Sinai in itself contains the two constituents, the ark and the tent of meeting, the unification of the two constituents in the Solomonic era is not the unification of Moses' cultic legacy and David's cultic legacy, but the restoration of Moses' cultic legacy in the Solomonic era.

### 3. 2. 1. 4. Solomon's attraction in the Greek period

Caquot finds evidence for Solomon's superior portrayal over David in the compositional setting of Chronicles. Caquot dates Chronicles in the Greek period, and maintains that the Chronicler depicts Solomon, a king of peace and wisdom, as superior to David in order that he might appeal to the Greeks.<sup>157</sup> The key for Caquot's dating of Chronicles into the Greek period is Jaddua in Neh 12:22:

As for the Levites, in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua, there were recorded the heads of ancestral houses; also the priests until the reign of Darius the Persian.

Based on Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, Caquot identifies 'Darius the Persian' as Darius III, Codomannus (336 – 330 BC), who is the last Darius in Persia, and places the latest figure in the list, Jaddua, in the early Greek period:<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., 116.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., 111.

When Jōannēs departed this life he was succeeded in the high priesthood by his son Jaddūs<sup>159</sup>. He too had a brother, named Manassēs, to whom Sanaballetēs – he had been sent to Samaria as satrap by Darius the last king.<sup>160</sup>

When Alexander died, his empire was partitioned among his successors (the Diadochi); as for the temple on Mount Garizein, it remained. And, whenever anyone was accused by the people of Jerusalem of eating unclean food or violating the Sabbath or committing any other such sin, he would flee to the Shechemites, saying that he had been unjustly expelled. Now by that time the high priest Jaddūs was also dead, and his son Onias succeeded to the high priesthood. This, then, was the way things were with the people of Jerusalem at that time.<sup>161</sup>

Josephus indicates that Jaddua, son of Joannes, lived in the time of the last Darius (§302), and when Alexander the Great died in 323 BC, Jaddua had also died by that time and his son Onias succeeded him (§346-347). According to Caquot, Jaddua served as a high priest in the early Greek period and thus Chronicles, which is the work of the same author as Ezra-Nehemiah, was composed in the Greek period.<sup>162</sup> This argument, of course, assumes that Joannes, the father of Jaddua, is Johanan of Neh 12:22. Assuming that this is correct, it is plausible to date Nehemiah in the Greek period if the appearance of the two names in the two sources is not mere coincidence.

Caquot's dating of Chronicles in the Greek period lies in his belief in the common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. However, dating Chronicles in the Greek period based on the text of Nehemiah is not a position that commands consensus in current Chronicles scholarship. After Japhet challenged the notion of the common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah<sup>163</sup> and Williamson substantiated arguments for separate authorship,<sup>164</sup> the majority of scholars no longer

---

<sup>159</sup> Biblical *Jaddua*

<sup>160</sup> Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities IX* (trans. Ralph Marcus; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 461 (§302).

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., 483 (§346-347).

<sup>162</sup> Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," 111.

<sup>163</sup> Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," 332-372.

<sup>164</sup> Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 5-82.

assume common authorship.<sup>165</sup> The main arguments for common authorship, such as the repetition of the Cyrus edict in 2 Chr 36:22-23 and Ezra 1:1-3a, the conjunction of some portions of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah in the book of Esdras, and the linguistic/stylistic/theological similarity of the works, are untenable.<sup>166</sup> If the common authorship theory is unsustainable, Caquot's attempt to posit Solomon's superiority over David as a function of the composition of Chronicles in the Greek period fails.

### 3. 2. 2. Anti-Samaritan polemic

Rudolph claims that the core motif of the Chronicler concerns true Israel, which is only found in Judah and thus Chronicles forms a polemic against Samaria.<sup>167</sup> According to Rudolph, the Chronicler focuses on the Davidic monarchy as the legitimate dynasty and the Jerusalem Temple as the legitimate cult site in order to discredit the northern kingdom, while he omits the history of the Exodus and Sinai, which are shared by both Jews and Samaritans.<sup>168</sup> Along this same line, Becker contends that the Chronicler's glorification of David and Solomon does not come from his interest in kingship itself but from his anti-Samaritan polemic.<sup>169</sup>

Does the Chronicler preserve the Davidic covenant as a polemic against the Samaritans, the northern kingdom, rather than as an expression of hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingship? Rudolph's argument for the Chronicler's anti-Samaritan polemic is four-fold.<sup>170</sup>

First, the Chronicler spells out Judah's prominent position among the ancient Israelite tribes in 1 Chr 5:1-2:

---

<sup>165</sup> E.g., Braun, *1 Chronicles*, xx; Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1-9*, 117; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 21-27; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 16.

<sup>166</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 21-27.

<sup>167</sup> Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, IX.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid.

<sup>169</sup> Becker, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*, 81.

<sup>170</sup> Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, IX.

The sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel. He was the firstborn, but because he defiled his father's bed his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph son of Israel, so that he is not enrolled in the genealogy according to the birthright; *though Judah became prominent among his brothers and a ruler came from him*, yet the birthright belonged to Joseph.

Secondly, unlike the order of Israel's sons in 1 Chr 2:1-2, the Chronicler places the headquarter tribes of the northern kingdom, Manasseh and Ephraim, at the end of his genealogical list in 1 Chr 7:14-28. This betrays the Chronicler's unfavorable stance toward the northern kingdom.

Thirdly, the narrowing of YHWH's election from all Israel to Judah is due to the rebellion of Jeroboam and the northern tribes (2 Chronicles 10). Afterwards, the northern kingdom's role is reduced to that of a 'breeding rod' (2 Chr 25:17ff; 28:9) and a seducer of Judah (2 Chr 18:1f; 19:2; 20:37; 22:7):

E.g., (breeding rod)

But a prophet of the LORD was there, whose name was Oded; he went out to meet the army that came to Samaria, and said to them, 'Because the LORD, the God of your ancestors, was angry with Judah, he gave them into your hand...' (2 Chr 28:9)

E.g., (seducer)

Then Eliezer son of Dodavahu of Mareshah prophesied against Jehoshaphat, saying, 'Because you have joined with Ahaziah, the LORD will destroy what you have made'. (2 Chr 20:37)

Finally, the northern kingdom practised improper worship after all the priests came to Judah (2 Chr 11:13-17). After the fall of the northern kingdom, Hezekiah invites northerners to Jerusalem for the Passover and receives a contemptuous response of the northern kingdom:

So the couriers went from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh, and as far as Zebulun; but they laughed them to scorn, and mocked them. (2 Chr 30:10)

However, upon investigation, Rudolph's arguments for the Chronicler's anti-Samaritan polemic do not look so cogent as they seem to be. In 1 Chr 5:1-2, though

the Chronicler distinguishes Judah as the strongest among the sons of Jacob, and the ancestor of David, his praise of Judah is not a slight toward Joseph, the ancestor of the main tribes of the northern kingdom. As the Chronicler acknowledges the prominence of Judah, he highlights the privilege of birthright upon Joseph. Noting that this is the only place in the Old Testament where the birthright is granted to Joseph, the Chronicler's consideration for the northern kingdom is heightened.<sup>171</sup> Thus, 1 Chr 5:1-2 does not imply a polemic against the northern kingdom. Rather both Judah and Joseph are deemed to be equally important.

Rudolph's second argument is the Chronicler's marginalization of Manasseh and Ephraim by placing them at the end of the tribal genealogical list.<sup>172</sup> Let us first sketch the general structure of the genealogy. The tribal genealogical list extends from 1 Chr 2:3 to 1 Chr 9:1 in the order of Judah, Reuben, Gad, the half tribe of Manasseh, Levi, Issachar, Benjamin, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, Asher, Benjamin. Out of the twelve tribes, the Chronicler omits Dan and Zebulun, and the genealogy of Benjamin occurs in two places: the short genealogy in 1 Chr 7:6-12 and the more detailed genealogy in 1 Chr 8:1-39. Though there are two entries for the genealogy of Manasseh, this is more natural than that of Benjamin's double listing, considering the geographical division of Manasseh. The Chronicler structures the genealogy around the three frame tribes: Judah in 1 Chr 2:3-4:23, Levi in 1 Chr 5:27 (6:1)-6:66 (81), and the main Benjamin genealogy in 1 Chr 8:1-39.<sup>173</sup> The genealogies of those three tribes are the most detailed and extended, and function as three posts: Judah in the beginning, Levi in the middle and Benjamin at the end. The Chronicler places Simeon, Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh between Judah and Levi in 1 Chr 4:24-5:26, and

---

<sup>171</sup> Although Gen 48:5 implies Jacob's special blessing upon Joseph, the direct attestation of Joseph's possession of the birthright occurs only in 1 Chr 5:1-2. Gen 48:5 - 'Therefore your two sons, who were born to you in the land of Egypt before I came to you in Egypt, are now mine; Ephraim and Manasseh shall be mine, just as Reuben and Simeon are'.

<sup>172</sup> Manasseh is the tribe to which Samaria, the capital of the northern kingdom belongs. Later Samaria, Ephraim, and Israel are used interchangeably referring to the northern kingdom. E.g., 'when I would heal Israel, the corruption of Ephraim is revealed, and the wicked deeds of Samaria; for they deal falsely, the thief breaks in, and the bandits raid outside'. (Hos 7:1)

<sup>173</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 67.

Issachar, the short genealogy of Benjamin, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, and Asher between Levi and the long genealogy of Benjamin in 1 Chr 7:1-40.

Based on the above data, the seemingly random order of the tribal genealogy could be explained in the following way. The Chronicler first selects the two Judean tribes of Judah and Benjamin to place them at the beginning and the end. Levi is located in the middle as the Levites take central place in the Israelites encampment (Num 2:17).<sup>174</sup> Having set these three posts, the Chronicler fills the two areas between the posts according to the geographical position of the tribes. He first puts Simeon and the transjordanian tribes between Judah and Levi. Simeon is probably located right after Judah because of its absorption into Judah at an early stage (Josh 19:9).<sup>175</sup> As for the transjordanian tribes, the Chronicler places three tribes from south to north in the order of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh.<sup>176</sup> Lastly, the Chronicler places cisjordanian tribes between the two posts of Levi and Benjamin. Unlike the transjordanian tribes, the cisjordanian tribes are not arranged from south to north.

Though the genealogies of Manasseh and Ephraim, the headquarter tribes of the norther kingdom, are placed in the latter part of the list of cisjordanian tribes, they are not at the end of the list. Rather, Asher is the last tribe in this group. While Judah the protagonist tribe's genealogy appears first, we cannot reckon that the Chronicler arranges the tribes in any order of preference. As examined above, the order of the tribal genealogy from 1 Chr 2:3 through 1 Chr 9:1 unfolds based on the Chronicler's multi-schemed frame. Thus the simple change of the order of the Joseph tribes from being 8<sup>th</sup> in 1 Chr 2:1 to 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> does not reflect the Chronicler's polemic against the northern kingdom.

In Rudolph's third argument, he imputes the narrowing of YHWH's election of Judah to the northerners' rebellion against the Davidic house. However, as

---

<sup>174</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 89. Num 2:17 - 'The tent of meeting, with the camp of the Levites, shall set out in the center of the camps; they shall set out just as they camp, each in position, by their regiments'.

<sup>175</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 84, Josh 19:9 - 'The inheritance of the tribe of Simeon formed part of the territory of Judah; because the portion of the tribe of Judah was too large for them, the tribe of Simeon obtained an inheritance within their inheritance'.

<sup>176</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 83.

Williamson maintains, the division was brought by God in order to keep his word as seen in 2 Chr 10:15:<sup>177</sup>

So the king did not listen to the people, because it was a turn of affairs brought about by God so that the LORD might fulfill his word, which he had spoken by Ahijah the Shilonite to Jeroboam son of Nebat. (2 Chr 10:15)

Here the Chronicler assumes the reader's familiarity with Ahijah's prophecy for Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 11:30-33:

When Ahijah laid hold of the new garment he was wearing and tore it into twelve pieces. He then said to Jeroboam: Take for yourself ten pieces; for thus says the LORD, the God of Israel, 'See, I am about to tear the kingdom from the hand of Solomon, and will give you ten tribes... this is because he has forsaken me, worshiped Astarte the goddess of the Sidonians, Chemosh the god of Moab, and Milcom the god of the Ammonites, and has not walked in my ways, doing what is right in my sight and keeping my statutes and my ordinances, as his father David did'.

Thus, the genuine reason for the division of the Davidic house is not due to the northerners' rebellion but to Solomon's transgression. Furthermore, God confirms his initiative of the division in the speech of Shemaiah to Rehoboam, who is ready to fight against the northerners:

Thus says the LORD: You shall not go up or fight against your kindred. Let everyone return home, for this thing is from me. (2 Chr 11:4)

It is also notable that the northerners are called 'kindred'.<sup>178</sup> After the rebellion, Rudolph contends, the northerners become reduced to being a breeding rod and seducer of Judah. Though northerners cause Judah to turn away from YHWH's will (2 Chr 18:1f; 19:2; 20:37; 22:7), their being a breeding rod (2 Chr 25:17ff; 28:9)

---

<sup>177</sup> Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 110.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid.



for Judah does not invoke a negative image in that they play a proper role as God's instrument.

Finally, Rudolph's argument that the northerners engage in improper worship does not necessarily reflect an anti-Samaritan polemic. The Chronicler clearly points out the digression of worship ever since Jeroboam appointed his own priests and built high places for idolatry:

The Levites had left their common lands and their holdings and had come to Judah and Jerusalem, because Jeroboam and his sons had prevented them from serving as priests of the LORD, and had appointed his own priests for the high places, and for the goat-demons, and for the calves that he had made. (2 Chr 11:14-15)

There is no doubt that the Chronicler condemns the unrighteous worship of Jeroboam and the northerners through the mouth of Abijah:

And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. Have you not driven out the priests of the LORD, the descendants of Aaron, and the Levites, and made priests for yourselves like the peoples of other lands?. But as for us, the LORD is our God, and we have not abandoned him...for we keep the charge of the LORD our God, but you have abandoned him. (2 Chr 13:8-11)

However, the Chronicler's inclusion of Hezekiah's invitation for the northerners to celebrate the Passover at the Jerusalem Temple (2 Chr 30:1-31:1), which is the Chronicler's *Sondergut*, attests to the Chronicler's sympathetic concern for the northerners. Namely, the Chronicler reprehends the northerners' improper worship itself, but aims to embrace northerners. The Chronicler does not exclude the northern transgressor in order to render Judah as the true Israel, but alludes to the unification of all Israel through the northerners' return to proper worship.<sup>179</sup> Hezekiah's command in the hand of the couriers to the northerners tersely reflects the point:

---

<sup>179</sup> Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, 125.

Do not now be stiff-necked as your ancestors were, but yield yourselves to the LORD and come to his sanctuary, which he has sanctified forever, and serve the LORD your God, so that his fierce anger may turn away from you. For as you return to the LORD, your kindred and your children will find compassion with their captors, and return to this land. For the LORD your God is gracious and merciful, and will not turn away his face from you, if you return to him. (2 Chr 30:8-9)

In his research on the concept of ‘Israel’, Williamson demonstrates that the Chronicler is inclusivist of the northerners rather than demonstrating an anti-Samaritan polemic.<sup>180</sup> A good example of the Chronicler’s attitude toward Judah and the northerners is his use of ‘Israel’ in the time of the monarchical division and its sequel in the reign of Rehoboam. There is no ‘true Israel’ bias in the Chronicler’s use of ‘Israel’ for the southern kingdom and the northern kingdom:<sup>181</sup>

	Southern Kingdom	Northern Kingdom
כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל	2 Chr 11:3; 12:1	2 Chr 10:16; 11:13
בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל	2 Chr 10:17	2 Chr 10:18
יִשְׂרָאֵל	2 Chr 12:6	2 Chr 10:16, 19; 11:1

To sum up, Rudolph’s four arguments for the anti-Samaritan polemic in Chronicles does not gain strong support from the text of Chronicles. In 1 Chr 5:1-2, the Chronicler points to the privilege of Joseph’s birthright as well as Judah’s dominance among the tribes. Given that the Chronicler arranges the tribal genealogical list based on his multi-schemed frame, it is problematic to find the Chronicler’s anti-Samaritan polemic simply in the shift of the Joseph tribes (Manasseh and Ephraim) in his genealogies from 8<sup>th</sup> (1 Chr 2:1) to 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> (1 Chr 7:14-29). The Chronicler attributes the division of the kingdom not to the rebellion of Israel but to God, assuming the readers’ familiarity with Ahijah’s prophecy for Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11:30-33) in which Ahijah regards Solomon’s transgression as the

<sup>180</sup> Ibid., 87-131.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid. 110.

cause of the division. The role of the northern kingdom in the life of Judah is characterized as both positive and negative. If the northerners' seduction of Judah is negative, then their being a 'breeding rod' of Judah as an instrument of God is positive. Regarding the northerners' inadmissible worship of golden calves and their cultic corruption, the Chronicler unequivocally condemns their iniquity. Yet his attitude toward the northern kingdom is embracing and inclusive rather than polemical and exclusive, as seen in Hezekiah's invitation for the northerners to visit the Jerusalem Temple and the Chronicler's unbiased use of the term 'Israel' for both the southern and the northern kingdoms. Without this anti-Samaritan polemic, Rudolph's attempt to understand the Chronicler's focus on the Davidic dynasty as a flashpoint in the southerner/northerner does not succeed.

#### 4. Conclusion

1 Chronicles 17, the core chapter of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles, is almost identical with its parallel text, 2 Samuel 7. The slight differences between the two texts reveal the Chronicler's view of the Davidic covenant as follows. Given that the Chronicler does not exclude מִצִּרִים consistently, it is difficult to regard the lack of מִצִּרִים in 1 Chr 17:5 as evidence of the Chronicler's intended suppression of the Sinai covenant with a view to magnifying the Davidic covenant. The intriguing variance between אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמִּעֵיךָ of 2 Sam 7:12 and אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ of 1 Chr 17:11 is due to stylistic, rather than theological, differences. The Chronicler's use of מַלְכוּת (1 Chr 17:11) for מַמְלָכָה (2 Sam 7:12) does not carry any substantial implications about the Davidic kingdom. Rather, it reflects the Chronicler's invocation of a word more commonly used in his own time. The lack of מַמְלָכָה in 1 Chr 17:12 does not attempt to weaken the Davidic kingdom because, strictly speaking, it is not an exclusion but an abridgement of מַמְלָכָתוֹ כִּסֵּא into כִּסֵּאוֹ. The conspicuous lack of the chastisement clause in 1 Chr 17:13 suggests neither messianism nor the conditionalization of the Davidic covenant, but corresponds to the following idealized portrayal of Solomon. The coexistence of the conditional and unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant reflects the organic relationship between the two. The Davidic covenant is conditional in that God punishes and

disciplines his people, and unconditional in that God's **חֶסֶד** does not depart from the Davidic house. Since the most plausible interpretation of the clause, **וְהָעִמְדָּתִיהוּ** **וּבְמִלְכוּתִי** in 1 Chr 17:14 is 'I shall establish him in (the service of) God's Temple and in my kingdom', this implies the strengthened role of the Davidic dynasty in the Temple rather than the weakening of the Davidic dynasty by the influence of the Temple and its cultus. The expression **לְכָבוֹד אֶת-עֲבָדְךָ** in 1 Chr 17:18 referring to David and the emphasis on David as YHWH's **עֶבֶד** by breaking the natural word order in 1 Chr 17:18 highlight the honour of David and his house.

The Chronicler's hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingship is attested by the following. Most of all, the Chronicler's use of **עוֹלָם** for the Davidic kingdom advocates for the revival of the Davidic dynasty. The range of **עוֹלָם** of the Davidic dynasty is not specified by the past-oriented phrase, **לְמִנְחָה** in 1 Chr 17:17, but by a stark phrase, **לֹא-אֲסִיר**, which bespeaks God's unfailing **חֶסֶד** upon the Davidic house, and the two uses of **עוֹלָם** (vv. 22, 24) other than its connection to the Davidic dynasty in 1 Chronicles 17. The use of **עוֹלָם** in 1 Chr 17:22 and 24 refers to the perpetuity of God's taking Israel as his people and the eternal praise of YHWH respectively. The Chronicler's deliberate equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH's kingdom (1 Chr 17:14) underscores the strong tie between the Davidic kingdom and the kingdom of YHWH. The reference to David's kingdom as YHWH's kingdom does not deprive David of ownership but enhances YHWH's attachment to the Davidic kingdom. David's responsive prayer to the oracle of Nathan, in which David exclusively focuses on his dynasty without even mentioning the Temple, disproves the cultic interpretation of 1 Chronicles 17. The Chronicler's faithful preservation of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 manifests his belief in the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty. The 'planting Israel' metaphor in 1 Chr 17:9 suggests viewing Chronicles as eschatological in a broad sense.

Though the Chronicler provides a description of a flawless Solomon, the Temple builder, throughout Chronicles, it does not require a competitive view of Chronicles as being either 'Solomonic' or 'Davidic'. The blessing of Solomon in Chronicles is read within God's blessing of David and his descendants. Since the text

of Chronicles does not indicate anti-Samaritan polemic, the attempts to understand the Chronicler's focus on the Davidic covenant with a view to an anti-Samaritan polemic rather than the hope of the restoration of the Davidic dynasty loses its force.

### III. The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chr 22:7-13

#### 1. Setting

The main proclamation of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is followed by a series of incidents: David's wars in 1 Chronicles 18-20; David's census, God's punishment, David's offering and the selection of the Temple site in 1 Chr 21:1-22:1, and David's preparation for the Temple construction in 1 Chr 22:2-19. As we have discussed before, the Chronicler's inclusion of David's census is not so much to point out David's inferiority to Solomon by revealing his dark side as to inform how the Temple site was selected.<sup>182</sup> Although there is no explicit link between the account of David's census and the selection of the Temple site in 2 Sam 24:1-25 (the synoptic passage of 1 Chr 21:1-27), the Chronicler renders 1 Chr 21:1-22:1 a useful bridge between David's war narrative in 1 Chronicles 18-20 and his preparation for the Temple construction in 1 Chronicles 22.

From 1 Chr 22:2, the Chronicler describes David's preparation for the Temple construction. After David assembles workers and collects materials (1 Chr 22:2-5), he calls Solomon and charges him with the Temple construction. In this charge, one finds the covenant as expressed in the familiar paternal-filial relationship and v. 10, in particular, forms the core of this promise:

הוּא־יִבְנֶה בַּיִת לְשִׁמִּי וְהוּא יִהְיֶה־לִּי לְבֵן וְאֲנִי־לּוֹ לְאָב  
וְהָכִינוֹתִי כִסֵּא מַלְכוּתוֹ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד־עוֹלָם

He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever.

#### 2. Textual Comparison<sup>183</sup>

1 Chr 22:10 corresponds to the Davidic covenant of Nathan's prophecy in 2 Sam 7:13-14 as well as 1 Chr 17:12-13:

---

<sup>182</sup> See p.76 of this work.

<sup>183</sup> Since there is no synoptic text of 1 Chr 22:10, I have used the title 'Textual Comparison' rather than 'Synoptic Comparison' for this section.

הוא יבנה בית לשמי וכננתי את־כסאו עד־עולם  
אני אהיה־לו לאב והוא יהיה־לי לבן

He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. (2 Sam 7:13-14)

הוא יבנה־לי בית וכננתי את־כסאו עד־עולם  
אני אהיה־לו לאב והוא יהיה־לי לבן

He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. (1 Chr 17:12-13)

Comparing 1 Chr 22:10 with 2 Sam 7:13-14 and 1 Chr 17:12-13, one finds slight differences among them. Let us first compare 1 Chr 22:10 with 1 Chr 17:12-13. Both 1 Chr 22:10 and the corresponding portion of 1 Chr 17:12-13 consist of four clauses. The table below matches the four clauses of 1 Chr 22:10 with the corresponding clauses of 1 Chr 17:12-13, though the order of the clauses has been altered.

1 Chr 17:12-13		1 Chr 22:10	
a	הוא יבנה־לי בית	A	הוא־יבנה בית לשמי
b	והוא יהיה־לי לבן	B	והוא יהיה־לי לבן
c	אני אהיה־לו לאב	C	ואני־לו לאב
d	וכננתי את־כסאו עד־עולם	D	והכינותי כסא מלכותו על־ישראל עד־עולם

If we label the four clauses of 1 Chr 22:10 as A, B, C, and D in the order of the text and the four corresponding clauses of 1 Chr 17:12-13 as a, b, c, and d, the actual order of 1 Chr 17:12-13 is a-d-c-b. Only B and b are identical. To compare A with a, A's לשמי corresponds to a's לי. As for C and c, no verb occurs in C, while the verb אהיה is present in c. The most notable difference is between D and d. Whereas the *hifil* form of כון is used in D, the *polel* form of כון occurs in d. D has the longer phrase מלכותו כסא while d has only כסאו with object marker את. Lastly, D's על־ישראל, which does not occur in d, defines the realm of the kingdom. The comparison between 1 Chr 22:10 and 1 Chr 17:12-13 discloses that 1 Chr 22:10

follows 1 Chr 17:12-13 closely, and the few changes in wording do not significantly alter the sense of the passages.

When we compare 1 Chr 22:10 and the corresponding part of 2 Sam 7:13-14, the similarity is further tightened. 2 Sam 7:13-14 is made up of four clauses, a', b', c', d' which correspond to the four clauses of 1 Chr 22:10, A, B, C, D as the following chart shows.

2 Sam 7:13-14	1 Chr 22:10
a' הוּא יִבְנֶה בַּיִת לְשִׁמִּי	A הוּא יִבְנֶה בַּיִת לְשִׁמִּי
b' וְהוּא יִהְיֶה לִּי לְבָן	B וְהוּא יִהְיֶה לִּי לְבָן
c' אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה לּוֹ לְאָב	C וְאֲנִי לּוֹ לְאָב
d' וְכִנֵּנְתִּי אֶת־כִּסֵּא מִמְּלָכָתוֹ עַד־עוֹלָם	D וְהִכִּנֵּנְתִּי כִסֵּא מַלְכוּתוֹ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד־עוֹלָם

Similar to 1 Chr 17:12-13, the order of the four clauses of 2 Sam 7:13-14 is a' - d' - c' - b'. In this comparison, A and a' and B and b' are identical. Comparison between C and c' reveals that the verb, אֶהְיֶה does not exist in C. The comparison between D and d' demonstrates a tighter correspondence between 1 Chr 22:10 and 2 Sam 7:13-14 than between 1 Chr 22:10 and 1 Chr 17:12-13. Though the *hifil* form of כוֹן of D and *polet* form of כוֹן in d' are different as the difference between D and d, כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתוֹ of D and כִּסֵּא מִמְּלָכָתוֹ of d' marks the closeness between 1 Chr 22:10 and 2 Sam 7:13-14. Instead of מִמְּלָכָתוֹ of d' the Chronicler takes מַלְכוּתוֹ because it was a more popular form in the time of the Chronicler.<sup>184</sup> As in 1 Chr 17:12-13, 2 Sam 7:13-14 has the object marker אֶת before כִּסֵּא but D's phrase, עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל does not exist.

The comparisons above indicate that there is no significant difference between the Davidic covenant of 1 Chr 22:10 and Nathan's prophecy of the promise in 1 Chr 17:12-13 and 2 Sam 7:13-14. In terms of wording, 1 Chr 22:10 reflects the wording of 2 Sam 7:13-14 more tightly than 1 Chr 17:12-13.

The Davidic covenant of 1 Chr 22:10 occurs within the context of David's charge to Solomon for the construction of the Temple, which consists of three units:

<sup>184</sup> See p. 33 of this work.



vv. 7b-10, vv. 11-13, and vv. 14-16. The three units are clearly divided by three markers: בְּנִי<sup>185</sup> ('My son') in v. 7, עַתָּה בְּנִי ('Now my son') in v. 11, וְהִנֵּה ('And behold!') in v. 14.

David's charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:7b-13 is the Chronicler's *Sondergut*. Though David's charge to Solomon in 1 Kgs 2:2-4 includes David's encouragement and summons for Solomon to keep the decrees of the Mosaic law as in 1 Chr 22:13, there is no trace of 1 Kgs 2:2-4 in 1 Chr 22:7b-13.<sup>186</sup>

In the first unit (1 Chr 22:7b-13), the Chronicler notably stresses the peacefulness of Solomon. God chooses Solomon, a 'man of peace' (אִישׁ מְנוּחָה), as the Temple builder and promises that he will give Solomon (שְׁלֹמֹה) peace (שָׁלוֹם) and quiet (שָׁקֵט) in his days:

הִנֵּה-בֵן נוֹלָד לָךְ הוּא יִהְיֶה אִישׁ מְנוּחָה וַהֲנַחֲוֹתִי לוֹ  
מִכָּל-אֹיְבָיו מִסָּבִיב כִּי שְׁלֹמֹה יִהְיֶה שְׁמוֹ וְשָׁלוֹם וְשָׁקֵט  
אֶתֵּן עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיָמָיו

See, a son shall be born to you; he shall be a *man of peace*. I will give him *peace* from all his enemies on every side; for his name shall be *Solomon*, and I will give *peace* and *quiet* to Israel in his days. (1 Chr 22:9)

As well as שָׁלוֹם, the two words from the root נוח (מְנוּחָה and וַהֲנַחֲוֹתִי) in 1 Chr 22:9 also highlight the peace that Solomon will enjoy.

Synoptic comparison between 1 Chronicles 17 and 2 Samuel 7 discloses that the Chronicler does not use נוח with reference to David. It is observed in the following comparisons between 2 Sam 7:1-2a and 1 Chr 17:1, and 2 Sam 7:11 and 1 Chr 17:10:

וַיְהִי כִּי-יָשָׁב הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּבֵיתוֹ וַיִּהְיֶה הַנִּיחָלוֹ מִסָּבִיב  
מִכָּל-אֹיְבָיו וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל-נָתָן הַנָּבִיא

<sup>185</sup> Qere. cf., Kethib - בְּנִי

<sup>186</sup> 1 Kgs 2:2-4 - I am about to go the way of all the earth. Be strong, be courageous, and keep the charge of the LORD your God, walking in his ways and keeping his statutes, his commandments, his ordinances, and his testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses, so that you may prosper in all that you do and wherever you turn. Then the LORD will establish his word that he spoke concerning me: 'If your heirs take heed to their way, to walk before me in faithfulness with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail you a successor on the throne of Israel'.

Now when the king was settled in his house, and the LORD had given him rest from all his enemies around him, the king said to the prophet Nathan. (2 Sam 7:1-2a)

וַיְהִי כִּאֲשֶׁר יָשָׁב דָּוִיד בְּבֵיתוֹ וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִיד אֶל־נָתָן הַנָּבִיא  
Now when David settled in his house, David said to the prophet  
Nathan,(1 Chr 17:1)

In 1 Chr 17:1, the clause containing David's נוח, מְסָבִיב, וַיְהִי הַנִּיחַ-לוֹ  
מִכָּל־אֹיְבָיו (2 Sam 7:1) does not exist.

וּלְמֶנֶח־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי שְׁפָטִים עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַהֲנִיחֹתִי  
לָךְ מִכָּל־אֹיְבֶיךָ  
From the time that I appointed judges over my people Israel; and I will  
give you rest from all your enemies. (2 Sam 7:11)

וּלְמִיָּמִים אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי שְׁפָטִים עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהִכְנַעְתִּי  
אֶת־כָּל־אֹיְבֶיךָ  
From the time that I appointed judges over my people Israel; and I will  
subdue all your enemies. (1 Chr 17:10)

Here, the Chronicler utilizes the verb, כנע rather than נוח, which results in the different wordings at the end of the verse: אֶת־כָּל־אֹיְבֶיךָ (1 Chr 17:10)// לָךְ מִכָּל־אֹיְבֶיךָ (2 Sam 7:11). Namely, unlike the author of Samuel, who writes of the divine gift of rest to David (2 Sam 7), the Chronicler uses the term, נוח, first not in the synoptic 1 Chr 17, but only in 1 Chr 22:9, where the Chronicler underscores the peacefulness of Solomon.

### 3. Further Issues

#### 3. 1. Is 'peace' an indicator of messianism?

Noticing the emphasis on 'peace' in 1 Chr 22:9, Theodor Lescow claims that 1 Chr 22:9 expresses hope for the birth of the Messiah.<sup>187</sup> He supports his contention

<sup>187</sup> Theodor Lescow, "Das Geburtstmotiv in den messianischen Weissagungen," ZAW 79 (1967), 205-207.

with the messianic passage of Isa 9:1-6 (2-7), where peace characterizes the messianic age:<sup>188</sup>

...For all the boots of the tramping warriors and all the garments rolled in blood shall be burned as fuel for the fire. For a child has been born for us, a son given to us; authority rests upon his shoulders; and he is named Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. His authority shall grow continually, and there shall be endless peace for the throne of David and his kingdom...

In this passage, the Messiah is called 'Prince of Peace' and his age means a time of endless peace, when a warrior has no use for his combat gear other than as 'fuel for the fire'. Lescow argues that 1 Chr 22:9 carries this same messianic ideology that is seen in Isa 9:1-6 (2-7):

See, a son shall be born to you...  
He shall be a man of peace...  
For his name shall be Solomon... (1 Chr 22:9)

As we have seen, the Chronicler, who is alert to the use of נוח, emphasizes 'peace' in 1 Chr 22:9 with five words of peace, מְנוּחָה, וְהַנְחוּתִי, שְׁלֹמֹה, שָׁלוֹם, וְשָׁקֵט and word play between שְׁלֹמֹה and שָׁלוֹם. Nevertheless, although the Chronicler highlights the peaceful image of Solomon here, it is unlikely that this verse was influenced by Isa 9:1-6 (2-7). With regard to the Hebrew word 'peace', the most relevant part of Isa 9:1-6 (2-7) for comparison with 1 Chr 22:9 is Isa 9:5-6a (6-7a):

For a child has been born for us, a son given to us; authority rests upon his shoulders; and he is named Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, *Prince of Peace* (שֶׁר־שָׁלוֹם). His authority shall grow continually, *and there shall be endless peace* (וְלִשְׁלוֹם אֵין־קֵץ).

There are two places where 'peace' is directly mentioned in Isa 9:5-6a (6-7a). The first is in the epithet of the Messiah, 'prince of peace' (שֶׁר־שָׁלוֹם) in v. 5 (6) and the second is in the second clause of v. 6 (7), 'and there shall be endless peace'

---

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., 205-206.

(וְלִשְׁלֹום אִין-קִין). The messianic epithet, ‘prince of peace’ (שִׁיר-שְׁלֹום) in Isa 9:5 (6) seems to corresponds to ‘man of peace’ (אִישׁ מְנוּחָה) in 1 Chr 22:9:

See, a son shall be born to you; he shall be a *man of peace*  
(אִישׁ מְנוּחָה). I will give him peace from all his enemies on every  
side...

If the Chronicler intended a messianic sense in 1 Chr 22:9 under the influence of Isa 9:5-6 (6-7), he would surely have used the distinctive epithet, שִׁיר-שְׁלֹום of Isa 9:5 (6) rather than the different phrase, אִישׁ מְנוּחָה, literally ‘man of rest’. Since the Chronicler is sensitive to the use of נוח as shown, it is improbable that the Chronicler would have ignored the different wording between the phrases, שִׁיר-שְׁלֹום and אִישׁ מְנוּחָה. It is possible to match the ‘peace’ clause ‘and there shall be endless peace’ (וְלִשְׁלֹום אִין-קִין) of Isa 9:6 (7) to the clause in 1 Chr 22:9, ‘I will give him peace from all his enemies on every side’ (וְהִנְחֹתִי לוֹ מִכָּל-אוֹיְבָיו מִסְבִּיב). However, there is no evidence that the messianic clause of Isa 9:6 (7) had an influence on 1 Chr 22:9. There is no similarity in wording between the two clauses.

Most of all, the clear mention of the past historical figure of Solomon in 1 Chr 22:9 militates against the messianic interpretation of 1 Chr 22:9. Earlier we investigated the attempt to read a messianic interpretation into the difference between אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מְבַנֶּיךָ of 1 Chr 17:11 and אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֵיךָ of 2 Sam 7:11. We argued that the Chronicler’s wording was due to stylistics rather than any messianic intent.<sup>189</sup> 1 Chr 22:9 is different from 1 Chr 17:11 in that the Chronicler clearly refers to the historic figure, Solomon, which opposes the messianic rendering of 1 Chr 22:9. Unlike the ambiguity around the clause of 1 Chr 17:11, אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מְבַנֶּיךָ, the Chronicler clearly names the man of peace as Solomon in 1 Chr 22:9, ‘For Solomon shall be his name’ (כִּי שְׁלֹמֹה יִהְיֶה שְׁמוֹ).

That the Chronicler does not present his desire for the coming of Messiah in 1 Chr 22:9 does not mean that the Chronicler is theocratic, in support of a Temple-centered society without political independence. If he supported the suppression of the

<sup>189</sup> See pp. 27-33 of this work.

Davidic dynasty with the religious cultic hierarchy of postexilic society, he would not have inserted God's promise of the eternal Davidic dynasty in this non-synoptic passage about the Temple construction at a time when the Davidic dynasty no longer existed. The insertion of the non-obligatory Davidic covenant reveals the Chronicler's hope for the resurgence of the Davidic dynasty based on the eternal Davidic covenant.

### 3. 2. Coexistence of unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant

As with the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 17:13-14, the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10 seems unconditional. However, the charge includes the requirement of observance of the Mosaic commandments as shown in 1 Chr 22:13:

Then you will prosper if you are careful to observe the statutes and the ordinances that the LORD commanded Moses for Israel. Be strong and of good courage. Do not be afraid or dismayed.

Though this conditional statement is not directly connected to the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10, the conditional statement in 1 Chr 22:13, which is within the same charge of David to Solomon, complements the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant. This statement of 1 Chr 22:13 resembles Josh 1:7 found within the Deuteronomistic History, where obedience and success are inseparable:

Only be strong and very courageous, being careful to act in accordance with all the law that my servant Moses commanded you; do not turn from it to the right hand or to the left, so that you may be successful wherever you go.

As argued previously, the unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles complement each other.<sup>190</sup> The Davidic covenant is conditional in the sense that God punishes Israel when they break the covenant, and unconditional in that God's mercy upon Israel does not cease. 1 Chr 22:6-13 reveals that the Chronicler embraces both the unconditional and conditional aspects of the Davidic covenant as he arranges them together in one statement as David's charge to Solomon.

---

<sup>190</sup> See pp. 38-41 of this work.

#### 4. Conclusion

The Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10 is the first occurrence of the dynastic promise following Nathan's oracle in 1 Chronicles 17. It appears within David's charge to Solomon regarding the Temple construction as David begins to prepare for the building project after the Temple site was selected. The wording of 1 Chr 22:10 does not deviate in any significant way from the two main Davidic covenant passages, 1 Chr 17:12-13 and 2 Sam 7:13-14. In terms of similarity, 1 Chr 22:10 traces the words of 2 Sam 7:13-14 more closely than 1 Chr 17:12-13.

The context of the Davidic covenant is David's speech to Solomon, which comprises three distinctive units: vv. 7b-10, vv. 11-13, and vv. 14-16. In the first unit, providing the reason for God's choice of Solomon as the Temple builder, the Chronicler stresses the peace of Solomon using five terms for peace (1 Chr 22:9). Lescow has attempted to show a messianic interpretation of 1 Chr 22:9 by comparing it with the messianic oracle in Isa 9:1-6 (2-7), but there is insufficient evidence to justify his assertion. Furthermore, the clear mention of historical figure Solomon in 1 Chr 22:9 opposes a messianic approach to the passage.

The Chronicler's inclusion of the Davidic covenant in this non-synoptic passage about the Temple construction reveals his longing for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty rather than his satisfaction with the postexilic Temple-centered cultic society. 1 Chr 22:7-13 express the Chronicler's hope *in nuce* in which the unconditional and conditional aspects of the Davidic covenant coexist. Whereas the Davidic covenant of 1 Chr 22:10 is unconditional, 1 Chr 22:13 includes the condition of obedience for ongoing success. The coexistence of the unconditional and conditional aspects of the promise in one passage provides evidence of the complementary relation between the two.

#### IV. The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chr 28:2-10

##### 1. Setting

If 1 Chr 22:6-16 is David's private charge to his son, then 1 Chr 28:2-10 is David's public commission of Solomon in the midst of all the people of Israel. It begins with an imperative clause, **שְׁמָעוּנִי אֲחֵי יַעֲקֹב** ('Hear me my brothers and my people!') in v. 2. 1 Chr 28:2-10 has two parts: King David's charge to the officials in vv. 2-8 and David's charge to Solomon in vv. 9-10. The plural forms of the imperative **שְׁמָרוּ** and **יִדְרָשׁוּ**, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural suffix **כֶּם** attached to **אֱלֹהִים** in v. 8 lucidly demonstrate a different set of recipients for David's charge from the individual indicated by the singular forms of 2<sup>nd</sup> person imperative, **רַע** and **וַעֲבֹדְהוּ**, and 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular suffix **ךָ** attached to **אָב** in v. 9.<sup>191</sup> In this public commission, the Davidic covenant is present in vv. 4-7.

There is no synoptic text of 1 Chr 28:2-10, but it is worthwhile to compare it with David's private instruction to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:7-13. Judging from the similarity between the two passages, it is conceivable that the Chronicler had 1 Chr 22:7-13 in mind when he composed 1 Chr 28:2-10.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> It is remarkable that a similar bipartite structure appears in Moses' summons to the Israelites and Joshua in Deut 31:1-8 when Joshua succeeds Moses. Moses summons the Israelites in vv. 1-6 and then directly summons Joshua in vv. 7-8:

When Moses had finished speaking all these words to all Israel, he said to them: 'I am now one hundred twenty years old. I am no longer able to get about, and the LORD has told me, "You shall not cross over this Jordan". The LORD your God himself will cross over before you. He will destroy these nations before you, and you shall dispossess them. Joshua also will cross over before you, as the LORD promised. The LORD will do to them as he did to Sihon and Og, the kings of the Amorites, and to their land, when he destroyed them. The LORD will give them over to you and you shall deal with them in full accord with the command that I have given to you. Be strong and bold; have no fear or dread of them, because it is the LORD your God who goes with you; he will not fail you or forsake you'. (vv. 1-6)  
Then Moses summoned Joshua and said to him in the sight of all Israel: 'Be strong and bold, for you are the one who will go with this people into the land that the LORD has sworn to their ancestors to give them; and you will put them in possession of it. It is the LORD who goes before you. He will be with you; he will not fail you or forsake you. Do not fear or be dismayed'. (vv. 7-8)

<sup>192</sup> S. J. De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, FOTL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmann, 1989), 217.

## 2. Textual Comparison

As the beginning of David's private charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:7 ('My son, I had planned to build a house to the name of the LORD my God'), the Chronicler expresses David's unfulfilled plan of the Temple construction at the beginning of his public commission of Solomon in 1 Chr 28:2 ('I had planned to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD'). This is reminiscent of David's words to Nathan in 1 Chr 17:1, 'I am living in a house of cedar, but the ark of the covenant of the LORD is under a tent'. Whereas God's rejection shortly follows David's hopes of building the Temple in 1 Chr 22:8, there is one more clause, **וְהָכִינוֹתִי לְבָנוֹת**, inserted between these two events:

David said to Solomon, 'My son, I had planned to build a house to the name of the LORD my God. But the word of the LORD came to me, saying, "You have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name"' (1 Chr 22:7-8)

I had planned to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD, for the footstool of our God; **וְהָכִינוֹתִי לְבָנוֹת**. But God said to me, 'You shall not build a house for my name'. (1 Chr 28:2-3)

Most English versions of the Bible translate the clause as David's preparation for the Temple construction:

And I made preparations for building. (NRSV)  
And I had made preparations to build it. (NKJV)  
And I laid aside material for building. (NJPS)  
And I was preparing to build it. (NAB)

In *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus interprets the clause as the gathering of the building materials:

Brothers and fellow-countrymen, I wish you to know that with the intention of building of a temple to God I collected a great quantity of gold and one hundred thousand talent of silver; but God, through the prophet Nathan, has kept me from doing so.<sup>193</sup>

---

<sup>193</sup> Flavius Josephus, *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities V-VIII*, trans by H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus, VII-371 (London: William Heinemann, 1958), 559.



Josephus' writing is more specific than the clause in the LXX:

καὶ ἡτοίμασα τὰ εἰς τὴν κατασκήνωσιν ἐπιτήδεια  
And I prepared the materials for the encamping.

All of the above translations suggest that in 1 Chr 28:2-3, David not only planned to build the Temple but also made preparations to build it. The translation of NAB, 'was preparing', gives the clearest sense that David's plan to build was frustrated by God in the midst of his preparations.

When did God prohibit David's Temple building project? Did he initiate an interdict when David only planned to build it as 1 Chr 17:1-4<sup>194</sup> and 1 Chr 22:7-8 suggest, or was it when David prepared labour and materials for the Temple building as the above translations of 1 Chr 28:2 indicate? To solve this tension, Keil maintains that **וְהַכִּינוֹתִי לְבָנוֹת** refers to David's preparations of labour and materials for the Temple building narrated in 1 Chr 22:2-4, 14-16:<sup>195</sup>

David gave orders to gather together the aliens who were residing in the land of Israel, and he set stonecutters to prepare dressed stones for building the house of God. David also provided great stores of iron for nails for the doors of the gates and for clamps, as well as bronze in quantities beyond weighing, and cedar logs without number-- for the Sidonians and Tyrians brought great quantities of cedar to David.

...  
With great pains I have provided for the house of the LORD one hundred thousand talents of gold, one million talents of silver, and bronze and iron beyond weighing, for there is so much of it; timber and stone too I have provided. To these you must add more. You have an abundance of workers: stonecutters, masons, carpenters, and all kinds of artisans without number, skilled in working gold, silver, bronze, and iron. Now begin the work, and the LORD be with you.

---

<sup>194</sup> 'Now when David settled in his house, David said to the prophet Nathan, "I am living in a house of cedar, but the ark of the covenant of the LORD is under a tent." Nathan said to David, "Do all that you have in mind, for God is with you." But that same night the word of the LORD came to Nathan, saying: "Go and tell my servant David: Thus says the LORD: You shall not build me a house to live in"'.

<sup>195</sup> Keil, *The Books of the Chronicles*, 291.

According to Keil, **וַהֲכִינוֹתִי לְבָנוֹת** of 1 Chr 28:2 corresponds to David's preparations of labour and materials for building the Temple in 1 Chronicles 22, and thereupon, in terms of temporal order, **וַהֲכִינוֹתִי לְבָנוֹת** is later than God's subsequent prohibition of David's Temple building project, which corresponds to 1 Chr 17:1-4. Leslie C. Allen clarifies this argument, saying:

David's 'preparations' sound like those made by the king in 1 Chr 22:2-5; yet, the text reads as if they occurred before the prophetic oracle of 1 Chr 17. The clause 'and I made preparations for building' (v. 2) probably breaks the continuity and has the sense 'and [subsequently] I have in fact...'.<sup>196</sup>

However, Keil and Allen's harmonization of the text seems forced since no temporal breaks are evident in the clause, **וַהֲכִינוֹתִי לְבָנוֹת**. In terms of chronology, it is frankly bizarre for David to speak of his past plan and recent preparations of the Temple building only to go back to God's past prohibition in 1 Chr 28:3.

To relieve the tension of the clause, **וַהֲכִינוֹתִי לְבָנוֹת** I suggest a new rendering of **וַהֲכִינוֹתִי** as 'And I intended'. Though 'to prepare' is the most common translation of the *hifil* form of **כּוּן** in the Old Testament, it also has a sense of 'to feel inclined', or 'to be intent on'.<sup>197</sup> If we apply this rendering, the reading of 1 Chr 28:2-3 no longer clashes with 1 Chr 17:1-4 and 1 Chr 22:7-8:

Hear me my brothers and my people! I planned to build the house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord and for the footstool of our God and I intended to build (it). But God said to me, "You shall not build a house for my name".

The reason for God's prohibition of David's Temple building project is abbreviated in 1 Chr 28:3 when compared with the rationale in 1 Chr 22:8:

You have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood in my sight on the earth. (1 Chr 22:8)

<sup>196</sup> Leslie C. Allen, "1 Chronicles," *NIB* III, ed., Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 460.

<sup>197</sup> "כּוּן," *HALOT* I, 465.

You shall not build a house for my name, for you are a warrior and have shed blood. (1 Chr 28:3)

Though Japhet analyzes 1 Chr 28:3 (a – ‘you may not build’, b – ‘for you are a man of war’, c – ‘and have shed blood’) as an inverted restatement of 1 Chr 22:8 (c – b – a),<sup>198</sup> ‘You have shed blood’ (c) appears again at the end of 1 Chr 22:8, and therefore it is more adequate to view 1 Chr 28:3 as an abbreviation of 1 Chr 22:8.

Having provided the rationale for God’s prohibition of David’s Temple building, the Chronicler expands David’s private instruction to Solomon along with David’s public commission of Solomon with different foci in 1 Chronicles 22 and 1 Chronicles 28 respectively. In 1 Chr 22:9 the Chronicler highlights Solomon as a man of peace (מְנוּחָה) before the announcement of the Temple builder and the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10. This is changed in 1 Chr 28:6-7 where the Chronicler skips any mention of Solomon as a ‘man of peace’ and precedes vv. 6-7 with the announcement of the Temple builder and the Davidic covenant by stressing the divine choice of Judah, David’s family, David, and Solomon in vv.4-5:

See, a son shall be born to you; he shall be a man of *peace* (מְנוּחָה). *I will give him peace* (וְהִנְחֵיתִי) from all his enemies on every side; for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give *peace* (שָׁלוֹם) and *quiet* (שָׁקֵט) to Israel in his days. (1 Chr 22:9)

Yet the LORD God of Israel *chose* (וַיִּבְחַר) me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever; for *he chose* (בָּחַר) Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father’s house, and among my father’s sons he took delight in making me king over all Israel. And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, *he has chosen* (וַיִּבְחַר) my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:4-5)

This divergence is understandable when we consider the contexts of the two charges. In David’s private charge to Solomon, David needed to enunciate the reason why God designated Solomon rather than David as the Temple builder. In David’s public

---

<sup>198</sup> Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 487.

commission of Solomon, David needed to declare before the Israelites the divine choice of his family for the throne of Israel. The key words of 1 Chr 22:9 are מְנוּחָה ('rest'), שָׁקֵט ('quietness'), and שְׁלֹום ('peace'), while the word בָּחַר ('to choose') permeates throughout 1 Chr 28:4-5.

After the announcement of the Temple builder and the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10 and 1 Chr 28:6-7, the private and public charges differ slightly. Within the private charge of 1 Chr 22:11-13, David blesses the Temple builder Solomon and encourages him to stay faithful to the law of God. Within the public charge of 1 Chr 28:8-10, however, David summons the assembly of Israel to keep the commandments of YHWH and instructs Solomon to seek God and be faithful in fulfilling the Temple building project:

Now, my son, the Lord be with you, so that you may succeed in building the house of the Lord your God, as he has spoken concerning you. Only, may the Lord grant you discretion and understanding, so that when he gives you charge over Israel you may keep the law of the Lord your God. Then you will prosper if you are careful to observe the statutes and the ordinances that the Lord commanded Moses for Israel. Be strong and of good courage. Do not be afraid or dismayed. (1 Chr 22:11-13)

Now therefore in the sight of all Israel, the assembly of the Lord, and in the hearing of our God, observe and search out all the commandments of the LORD your God; that you may possess this good land, and leave it for an inheritance to your children after you forever. And you, my son Solomon, know the God of your father, and serve him with single mind and willing heart; for the Lord searches every mind, and understands every plan and thought. If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever. Take heed now, for the Lord has chosen you to build a house as the sanctuary; be strong, and act. (1 Chr 28:8-10)

Once again the differences between the two charges lie in the different addressees. Overall, David's public commission of Solomon in 1 Chr 28:2-10 parallels David's private charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:6-13 with the deviation due mainly to the public context of the assembly of Israel in 1 Chr 28:2-10.

### 3. Further Issues

### 3. 1. Coexistence of unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant

David's public commission of Solomon in 1 Chr 28:2-10 presents the Davidic covenant twice; once implicitly in v. 4 and then explicitly in v.7 :

וַיִּבְחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּי מִכָּל בֵּית-אָבִי לִהְיוֹת לְמֶלֶךְ  
עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעוֹלָם

Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever. (1 Chr 28:4)

וְהָכִינוֹתִי אֶת-מַלְכוּתוֹ עַד-לְעוֹלָם אִם-יִחַזֵּק לַעֲשׂוֹת מִצְוֹתַי  
וּמִשְׁפָּטַי כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה

I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today. (1 Chr 28:7)

In comparison with the unconditional Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10, the explicit reference to the covenant in 1 Chr 28:7 is conditional:

He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever. (1 Chr 22:10)

I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today. (1 Chr 28:7)

Interestingly, just as David's private charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:6-13 includes both unconditional (v. 10) and conditional (v. 13)<sup>199</sup> aspects, so too both coexist in David's public commission of Solomon in 1 Chr 28:2-10. In contrast to the conditional Davidic covenant mentioned explicitly in 1 Chr 28:7, the Davidic covenant alluded to implicitly in 1 Chr 28:4 is without condition.

Along with the conditional statement of 1 Chr 28:7, there are strong conditional elements in 1 Chr 28:9, where covenant terminology יָדַע ('to know') and

---

<sup>199</sup> 'Then you will prosper if you are careful to observe the statutes and the ordinances that the LORD commanded Moses for Israel. Be strong and of good courage. Do not be afraid or dismayed'.

David's strong warning for Solomon, לְעַד יִנְיָחֶךָ ('he will reject you forever') are present:

And you, my son Solomon, *know* (יָדַע) the God of your father, and serve him with single mind and willing heart; for the LORD searches every mind, and understands every plan and thought. *If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever.* (1 Chr 28:9)

As Herbert B. Huffmon observes, the technical covenantal use of יָדַע appears in both ancient Near Eastern treaty documents and the Old Testament.<sup>200</sup> In one Hittite treaty document, Hittite king, Suppiluliumas speaks as a Suzerain to his vassal, Huqqanas:

And you, Huqqanas *know* only the Sun regarding lordship; also my son (of) whom I, the Sun, say, 'This one everyone should *know*... Moreover, another lord... do not *know*! The Sun (alone) *know*'<sup>201</sup>

In this treaty 'to know' implies a technical legal recognition with responsibility rather than a simple acquisition of knowledge or information. In the Old Testament, Hos 13:4-5 and Amos 3:2 serve as good examples of יָדַע as a technical covenantal term:

Yet I have been the LORD your God ever since the land of Egypt. And *you shall know* (תִּדְעוּ) no God but Me; For there is no Savior besides Me. *I knew you* (יָדַעְתִּיךָ) in the wilderness, in the land of great drought. (Hos 13:4-5, my translation)

You only *have I known* (יָדַעְתִּי) of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. (Amos 3:2)

As Huffmon points out regarding Hos 13:5, God's 'knowledge' of Israel in the wilderness is unmistakably God's covenant at Mount Sinai.<sup>202</sup> In the context of Hos 13:4, Israel's 'knowing' God involves the fulfillment of the covenant stipulation on

---

<sup>200</sup> Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Treaty Background of Hebrew יָדַע," *BASOR* 181 (1966), 31-37.

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.*, 31-32.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

the part of Israel. In Amos 3:2, God ‘knowing’ involves his recognition of Israel as a covenant partner. Since Israel did not obey God’s covenant stipulations, God proclaims a punishment upon Israel through the mouth of Amos. Likewise, the imperative form of יִדַּע appearing in David’s charge to Solomon (1 Chr 28:9) carries a sense of covenantal stipulation. The following אִם (if) clauses reinforce this sense:

אִם-תִּדְרֹשׁנוּ יִמָּצֵא לָךְ וְאִם-תִּעְזֹבֵנוּ יִזְנִיחֶךָ לְעַד

If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever. (1 Chr 28:9).

### 3. 2. Originality of 1 Chr 28:4-5

Braun argues in his commentary that vv. 4-5 of 1 Chronicles 28 is not original to the Chronicler but is a secondary addition.<sup>203</sup> Since vv. 4-5 include implicit mention of the Davidic covenant, we need to examine Braun’s arguments, which may be summarized as follows:

- (1) The connection between vv. 6 and 10 [*sic*]<sup>204</sup> is interrupted by vv. 4-5.
- (2) The concern elsewhere in this pericope is with Solomon as temple builder, not, as here, with Solomon as king.
- (3) Several other items, while not contradicting the views of the Chronicler, are expressed here in an unusual way:
  - (a) The omission of כָּל ‘all’ before Israel in both vv. 4 and 5 (although ‘all Israel’ does occur one time in v. 4) seems strangely reticent for the Chronicler in this connection. (cf., 1 Chr 29:21-26)
  - (b) The reference to an election of Judah is unparalleled elsewhere in Chronicles.
  - (c) The root רָצָה (‘to be pleased’), used here of the election of David, occurs elsewhere in Chronicles only in the difficult 1 Chr 29:3, where its meaning is entirely different.
  - (d) The reference to the ‘throne of the kingdom of YHWH over Israel’, while in general agreement with the Chronicler’s thought (cf. 1 Chr 29:3), is unusually extended and verbose as compared to the simpler ‘throne of Yahweh’ of that verse, as well as the direct מַלְכוּתוֹ ‘his kingdom’ of v. 7.<sup>205</sup>

<sup>203</sup> Braun, *1 Chronicles*, 268.

<sup>204</sup> Braun certainly means vv. 3 and 6.

<sup>205</sup> Braun, *1 Chronicles*, 268.

Let us examine each argument. With regard to the first point, Braun suggests that v. 6, where God declares Solomon as the Temple builder, smoothly connects to v. 3, which provides the rationale for God's prohibition of David's Temple construction. However, one could argue that vv. 4-5 do not interrupt the flow of David's speech to the assembly of Israel. Rather, vv. 4-5 play the important role of introducing the Temple builder, Solomon. Before the announcement of the Temple builder, David informs the assembly about Solomon. Solomon is chosen as king of Israel, just as his ancestors and ancestral tribe Judah were elected by God. To mention the divine election of Solomon is important given that it could elicit the support of the Israelite assembly for Solomon's Temple building. The declaration of Solomon as the Temple builder follows the process of narrowing down the divine choice from Judah, to David's family, to David, and then to Solomon. Like 1 Chr 28:4-6, Nathan prophesies in 1 Chr 17:10-12 concerning the establishment of the Davidic kingdom and Solomon's enthronement before the announcement of the Temple builder:

Moreover I declare to you that the LORD will build you a house. When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for me.

Thus, it is not necessary to view 1 Chr 28:4-5 as an interruption between 1 Chr 28:3 and 28:6.

Braun's second argument that Solomon is viewed in this pericope not as a king but only as the Temple builder may also be challenged as it appears to run counter to the flow of the text. Though the pericope is mainly about the Temple building project, the kingship of Solomon is not ignored in the text outside of vv.4-5. The explicit Davidic covenant in v.7 unequivocally manifests the Chronicler's interest in the kingship of Solomon:

I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today.



This pericope views Solomon not only as the Temple builder but also as a king of the Davidic dynasty.

Braun's third argument is based upon the presence of four unusual elements in vv. 4-5. The first element is the lack of כָּל ('all') before 'Israel' in these verses. There are four occurrences of Israel in vv. 4-5:

Yet the LORD *God of Israel* (אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) chose me from all my ancestral house to be king *over Israel* (עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל) forever; for he chose Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father's house, and among my father's sons he took delight in making me king *over all Israel* (עַל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל). And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD *over Israel* (עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל).

As one can see, and even as Braun acknowledges, the absence of כָּל is not consist in vv. 4-5. The third occurrence of Israel in the passage is accompanied by כָּל.

Moreover, the other two expressions, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, and the two occurrences of עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל, are not unfamiliar phrases to the Chronicler. Throughout Chronicles the phrase, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, occurs 32 times<sup>206</sup> and עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs 25 times.<sup>207</sup> Even though 'all Israel' is one of the core subjects in Chronicles, we do not need to regard the lack of 'all' before 'Israel' as non-Chronistic.<sup>208</sup> In fact, there is no phrase like אֱלֹהֵי כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל ('God of all Israel') in Chronicles, and עַל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל ('over all Israel') occurs only eight times.<sup>209</sup> Thus, it would appear that the phrases אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל and עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל are not at all unusual for the Chronicler.

Braun also compares 1 Chr 29:21-26, in which 'all Israel' is used frequently, to 1 Chr 28:4-5:

<sup>206</sup> 1 Chr 5:26; 15:12, 14; 16:4, 36; 17:24; 22:6; 23:25; 24:19; 28:4; 29:10; 2 Chr 2:11; 6:4, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17; 11:16; 13:5; 15:4, 13; 20:19; 29:10; 30:1, 5; 32:17; 33:16, 18; 34:23, 26; 36:13

<sup>207</sup> 1 Chr 6:34 (49); 11:3, 10; 14:2; 16:40; 21:1; 22:9, 10, 12, 13; 23:1; 26:29; 27:24; 28:4, 5; 29:25, 27, 30; 2 Chr 1:13; 2:3; 13:5; 17:1; 24:9; 28:13; 35:25

<sup>208</sup> Regarding 'all Israel' see p. 89 of this work.

<sup>209</sup> 1 Chr 12:39 (38); 14:8; 18:14; 28:4; 29:26; 2 Chr 9:30; 29:24; 30:1

On the next day they offered sacrifices and burnt offerings to the LORD, a thousand bulls, a thousand rams, and a thousand lambs, with their libations, and sacrifices in abundance *for all Israel* (לְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל); and they ate and drank before the LORD on that day with great joy. They made David's son Solomon king a second time; they anointed him as the LORD's prince, and Zadok as priest. Then Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD, succeeding his father David as king; he prospered, and *all Israel* (כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל) obeyed him. All the leaders and the mighty warriors, and also all the sons of King David, pledged their allegiance to King Solomon. The LORD highly exalted Solomon in the sight of *all Israel* (כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל), and bestowed upon him such royal majesty as had not been on any king before him *in Israel* (עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל). Thus David son of Jesse reigned *over all Israel* (עַל־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל).

However, as above, כָּל does not always precede 'Israel'; the fourth occurrence of Israel in v. 25b lacks כָּל. Furthermore, Braun's delimitation of the passage to 1 Chr 29:21-26 is arbitrary. Immediately following 1 Chr 29:26, there is another occurrence of 'Israel' without כָּל:

The period that he reigned *over Israel* (עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל) was forty years; he reigned seven years in Hebron, and thirty-three years in Jerusalem. (1 Chr 29:27)

Braun refers to the election of Judah in v. 4 as the second unusual element in 1 Chr 28:4-5. However, the election of Judah is not an unusual theme for the Chronicler. In the Chronicler's genealogy of chapters 1-9, Judah not only takes first place among the twelve tribes of Israel even though he is not the firstborn, he also takes a large portion of the tribal genealogy in 1 Chr 2:3-4:23. Unlike the Deuteronomistic history, where the kings of Judah and northern Israel are included in the narrative, Chronicles unfolds the history of Israel exclusively through the kingdom of Judah. Particularly, in 1 Chr 28:4-5, the election of Judah forms the foundational backdrop to point to the divine choice of David's family, David, and Solomon. The election theme using בָּחַר runs through vv 4-5 and continues in v. 6:

He said to me, ‘It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts, for *I have chosen* (בְּחַרְתִּי) him to be a son to me, and I will be a father to him’. (1 Chr 28:6)

The penetrating theme of ‘election’ through vv. 4-6 suggests the cohesiveness of vv. 4-5 and the following verse(s).

Braun suggests that there is a third unusual element, רָצָה (‘to be pleased’) in 1 Chr 28:4, but this is, in fact, not unusual to the Chronicler at all. Braun points to 1 Chr 29:3 as the only other occurrence of רָצָה in Chronicles, but this is simply not the case. In addition to 1 Chr 28:5 and 1 Chr 29:3, there are three more places where רָצָה appears in Chronicles:

I know, my God, that *you* search the heart, and *take pleasure* (תִּרְצֶה) in uprightness. (1 Chr 29:17)

They answered him, ‘If *you* will be kind to this people *and please them* (וּרְצִיתֵם), and speak good words to them, then they will be your servants forever’. (2 Chr 10:7)

To fulfill the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land *had enjoyed* (רָצְתָהּ) her Sabbaths. All the days that it lay desolate it kept sabbath to fulfill seventy years. (2 Chr 36:21, my translation)

Considering there are only two occurrences of רָצָה in Samuel-Kings (1 Sam 29:4; 2 Sam 24:23) one can argue that רָצָה is not such an unusual term for the Chronicler after all.

The fourth unusual element Braun identifies in 1 Chr 28:4-5 is a verbose phrase ‘the throne of the kingdom of YHWH over Israel’ in 1 Chr 28:5:

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon *the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel* (כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּת יְהוָה עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל).

Braun compares this long phrase with the shorter phrases ‘throne of YHWH’ or ‘his kingdom’ in 1 Chr 28:7. However, the Chronicler already used a longer phrase, ‘the

throne of his kingdom over Israel’ in David’s private charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:10:

He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him; and I will establish *the throne of his kingdom over Israel* (כִּפֹּא מַלְכוּתוֹ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל) forever. (my translation)

Thus it is unconvincing to view the long phrase, ‘the throne of the kingdom of YHWH over Israel’ as secondary to the Chronicler’s writing.

In sum, there is no reason to view 1 Chr 28:4-5 as secondary. Rather, as De Vries demonstrates, 1 Chr 28:4-5 contributes to the chiasmic structure of the larger context:

- a David’s perpetual rule (v. 4a)
- b David’s selection by tribe, family, individual (v. 4b)
- b’ Solomon’s selection out of numerous sons (v. 5)
- a’ Solomon’s perpetual rule (v. 7)<sup>210</sup>

By determining 1 Chr 28:4-5 as original to the Chronicler, we can perceive the significance of the Davidic covenant for this ancient author. On top of the explicit reference to the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 28:7, the Chronicler reinforces the importance of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 28:4-5 by mentioning the kingship of the Davidic house three times:

*Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever; for he chose Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father’s house, and among my father’s sons he took delight in making me king over all Israel. And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:4-5)*

### 3. 3. Implications of 1 Chr 28:4-5

The implication of vv.4-5 in David’s public commission of Solomon lies in the significance for the Chronicler of the Davidic covenant as well as the Temple

---

<sup>210</sup> De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 217.

building project. God's refusal to permit David to build the Temple in v. 3 is compensated for by God's choice of David for the kingship of Israel in the following verse. It begins with an adversative *waw* conjunction clause:

וַיִּבְחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּי מִכָּל בֵּית־אָבִי לְהִיּוֹת  
לְמֶלֶךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעוֹלָם

*Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me from all my ancestral house  
to be king over Israel forever.*

Having stated God's election of David for the kingship over Israel in v. 4a, the Chronicler then narrates a more specific procedure of the election in v. 4b:

For he chose Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father's  
house, and among my father's sons he took delight in making me king  
over all Israel.

It is noticeable that in 1 Chr 28:4-5, God's choice of Solomon occurs alongside God's choice of David:

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, *he has chosen*  
*my son Solomon* (וַיִּבְחַר בְּשִׁלְמֹה בְנִי) to sit upon the throne of the  
kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:5)

As for the divine choice of Solomon, Japhet asserts that it is the selection of Solomon 'which in effect diminishes the value of David's election and the dynastic promise'.<sup>211</sup> According to Japhet, Solomon, who was individually elected by YHWH like David, is different from the subsequent kings of Judah.<sup>212</sup>

It is certainly a special election considering the significance of the term **בָּחַר**. Throughout the Old Testament, when God is the subject of **בָּחַר**, there are only seven individuals, who became the privileged objects of **בָּחַר** - Abraham (Neh 9:7), Aaron (Num 16:5, 7; 17:20 (5); Ps 105:26), Moses (Ps 106:23), Saul (1 Sam 10:24; 2 Sam

<sup>211</sup> Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, 452.

<sup>212</sup> Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 488.

21:6), David (2 Sam 6:21; 1 Kgs 8:16; 11:34; Ps 78:70; 89:4 (3); 1 Chr 28:4; 2 Chr 6:6), Solomon (1 Chr 28:5, 6, 10; 29:1), and Zerubbabel (Hag 2:23):<sup>213</sup>

Individuals	Passages
Abraham	You are the <i>Lord, the God who chose Abram</i> (יְהוָה בָּחַרְתָּ אֶת אַבְרָם) and brought him out of Ur of the Chaldeans and gave him the name Abraham; (Neh 9:7)
Aaron	In the morning the Lord will make known who is his, and who is holy, and who will be allowed to approach him; <i>the one whom he will choose</i> (אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר-בּוֹ) he will allow to approach him. (Num 16:5)  And tomorrow put fire in them, and lay incense on them before the LORD; and <i>the man whom the LORD chooses</i> (הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר-יִבְחַר יְהוָה) shall be the holy one. (Num 16:7)  And the staff of <i>the man whom I choose</i> (הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר אֶבְחַר-בּוֹ) shall sprout. (Num 17:20 (5))  He sent his servant Moses, and Aaron <i>whom he had chosen</i> (אֶהְרֹן אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר-בּוֹ). (Ps 105:26)
Moses	Therefore he said he would destroy them-- <i>had not Moses, his chosen one, stood in the breach before him</i> (לֹא-לִי מוֹשֶׁה בְּחִירוֹ עָמַד בַּפֶּרֶץ לִפְנָיו), to turn away his wrath from destroying them. (Ps 106:23)
Saul	Samuel said to all the people, “ <i>Do you see the one whom the LORD has chosen</i> (הַרְאִיתֶם אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר-בּוֹ יְהוָה)? There is no one like him among all the people.” (1 Sam 10:24)  Let seven of his sons be handed over to us, and we will hang them before the LORD <i>in Gibeah of Saul, whom the LORD chose</i> (בְּחִיר יְהוָה). (2 Sam 21:6, my translation)
David	David said to Michal, “It was before <i>the LORD, who chose me</i> (יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר-בִּי) in place of your father and all his household, to appoint me as prince over Israel. (2 Sam 6:21, my translation)

<sup>213</sup> The divine choice (בחר) of Jacob in Ps 135:4; Isa 41:8, 9; 44:1, 2 are in a collective sense, viz., Israel.

	<p><i>But I chose David to be over my people Israel</i> (וַאֲבָחַר בְּדָוִד לִהְיוֹת עַל-עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל). (1 Kgs 8:16)</p> <p>Nevertheless I will not take the whole kingdom away from him but will make him ruler all the days of his life, <i>for the sake of my servant David whom I chose</i> (לְמַעַן דָּוִד אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתִּי אֹתוֹ). (1 Kgs 11:34)</p> <p><i>He chose his servant David</i> (וַיִּבְחַר בְּדָוִד עַבְדּוֹ), and took him from the sheepfolds. (Ps 78:70)</p> <p>You said, ‘<i>I have made a covenant with my chosen one</i> (כְּרַתִּי בְרִית לְבַחֲרִי), I have sworn to my servant David’. (Ps 89:4 (3))</p> <p><i>Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me</i> (וַיִּבְחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּי from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever. (1 Chr 28:4)</p> <p><i>And I have chosen David to be over my people Israel</i> (וַאֲבָחַר בְּדָוִד לִהְיוֹת עַל-עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל). (2 Chr 6:6//1 Kgs 8:16)</p>
Solomon	<p>And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, <i>he has chosen my son Solomon</i> (וַיִּבְחַר בְּשִׁלֹּמֹה בְנִי) to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:5)</p> <p>He said to me, ‘It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts, <i>for I have chosen him to be a son to me</i> (כִּי-בָחַרְתִּי בּוֹ לִי לְבֵן)’. (1 Chr 28:6)</p> <p>Take heed now, <i>for the LORD has chosen you</i> (כִּי-יְהוָה בָּרָךְ) to build a house as the sanctuary. (1 Chr 28:10)</p> <p><i>My son Solomon, whom alone God has chosen</i> (שִׁלֹּמֹה בְנִי אֶחָד בָּחַר-בּוֹ אֱלֹהִים), is young and inexperienced, and the work is great. (1 Chr 29:1)</p>
Zerubbabel	<p>I will take you, O Zerubbabel my servant, son of Shealtiel, says the LORD, and make you like a signet ring; <i>for I have chosen you</i> (כִּי-בָרַךְ בָּחַרְתִּי). (Hag 2:23)</p>

However, it is not convincing to suggest that the application of the important term **בחר** to Solomon implies a diminished view of David’s election and the dynastic

promise. It does not signify that God's election of Solomon is independent of God's promise to David. There are four places where בָּחַר is applied to Solomon in Chronicles: 1 Chr 28:5, 6, 10, and 1 Chr 29:1. All of these occur in David's speech. Of these four occurrences, בָּחַר in 1 Chr 28:6, 10 and 1 Chr 29:1 refers to God's election of Solomon in light of becoming the Temple builder rather than in view of the kingdom and the dynastic promise. Among them, 1 Chr 28:10 is most straightforward:

Take heed now, for the LORD has chosen you to build a house as the sanctuary. (1 Chr 28:10)

In 1 Chr 28:6, בָּחַר is likewise used in the context Solomon's Temple building mission:

He said to me, '*It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts, for I have chosen him to be a son to me*'. (1 Chr 28:6)

In 1 Chr 29:1, Solomon, though 'young and inexperienced', is chosen for the great work of Temple building:

My son Solomon, whom alone God *has chosen* is young and inexperienced, and the work is great.

The only location that speaks of God's election of Solomon in view of the kingdom and the dynastic promise is 1 Chr 28:5:

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel.

There is no sense that God's election of David and the dynastic promise upon David is somehow denigrated by God's election of Solomon. In 1 Chr 28:5, Solomon is qualified twice by David as his son. God chooses Solomon to sit on the throne of God's kingdom because he is a son of David. That is to say, to be chosen by God, one



should be a descendant of David. To emphasize the qualification, the Chronicler places the adverbial phrase, **וּמִכָּל־בָּנָי** ('and of all my sons') at the beginning of the sentence:

וּמִכָּל־בָּנָי כִּי רַבִּים בָּנִים נָתַן לִי יְהוָה וַיִּבְחַר בְּשִׁלֹּמֹה בְּנִי  
לְשִׁבְתָּ עַל־כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּת יְהוָה עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל (1 Chr 28:5)

Solomon is once again qualified by **בְּנִי**, 'my son', in the middle of the verse. Namely, God's election of Solomon is to be understood under the shadow of David whom God elected and upon whom he conferred the dynastic promise.

David's charge also mentions Solomon in v. 6 and v. 9, and again Solomon is qualified as David's son:

He said to me, 'It is *your son Solomon* who shall build my house and my courts'. (1 Chr 28:6)

And you, *my son Solomon*, know the God of your father, and serve him with single mind and willing heart. (1 Chr 28:9)

Considering that no other Israelite kings after Solomon become the object of YHWH's election (**בָּחַר**), God's election of Solomon is special.<sup>214</sup> However, it is also true that throughout Chronicles the efficacy of the dynastic promise comes not from God's election of Solomon but from God's election of David. The Chronicler repeats the importance of David's election and his dynasty:

O LORD God, let your promise to my father David now be fulfilled, for you have made me king over a people. (2 Chr 1:9)

And I have chosen David to be over my people Israel. (2 Chr 6:6)

Now the LORD has fulfilled his promise that he made; for I have succeeded my father David, and sit on the throne of Israel, as the LORD promised. (2 Chr 6:10)

---

<sup>214</sup> Principally, all the Israelite kings are God's chosen ones as Deut 17:15 reveals: 'You may indeed set over you a king whom the LORD your God *will choose* (**יִבְחַר**)'.

You who have kept for your servant, my father David, what you promised to him. Indeed, you promised with your mouth and this day have fulfilled with your hand. (2 Chr 6:15)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him, saying, ‘There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me’. (2 Chr 6:16)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, let your word be confirmed, which you promised to your servant David. (2 Chr 6:17)

O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one. Remember your steadfast love for your servant David. (2 Chr 6:42)

Then I will establish your royal throne, as I made covenant with your father David saying, ‘You shall never lack a successor to rule over Israel’. (2 Chr 7:18)

Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? (2 Chr 13:5)

Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David because of the covenant that he had made with David, and since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever. (2 Chr 21:7)

Jehoiada said to them, ‘Here is the king’s son! Let him reign, as the LORD promised concerning the sons of David’. (2 Chr 23:3)

Solomon’s election to inherit the kingdom is, unlike God’s election of David, never mentioned after Solomon’s reign.

In summary, God’s election of Solomon for the kingship of Israel using the term **בָּחַר** puts Solomon in a special place, separate from the following kings of Judah. However, the Chronicler views this special election under the shadow of God’s election of David. Accordingly, God’s election of David and the dynastic promise is not diminished in Chronicles.

#### 4. Conclusion

The Davidic covenant is referred to both implicitly in 1 Chr 28:4 and explicitly in 1 Chr 28:7. Just as 1 Chr 22:6-13 includes both unconditional (v. 10) and conditional (v. 13) aspects of the covenant, these unconditional (v. 4) and the

conditional (v. 7) aspects also occur in 1 Chr 28:2-10. In addition to the conditional dynastic promise in 1 Chr 28:7, the technical covenantal term **יָדַע** and the strong warning of God's rejection in 1 Chr 28:9 represent the conditional character of the Davidic covenant.

With regard to 1 Chr 28:4-5 where the Davidic covenant is present, Braun contends with multiple arguments that 1 Chr 28:4-5 is not original to the Chronicler but is a later expansion. However, as demonstrated above, his arguments do not stand up to scrutiny. In opposition to Braun's argument, the cohesive chiasmic structure of vv. 4-7 advocates for the originality of vv. 4-5. Having shown that vv. 4-5 is original to the Chronicler, one can suggest that the Chronicler has a keen interest in the Davidic kingdom and the dynastic promise as well as the Temple building project.

In the short passage of vv. 4-5, the Chronicler mentions the kingship of the Davidic house three times. Contrary to Japhet's claim, although God's choice of Solomon as indicated by the verb **בָּחַר** is certainly special, this privileged election does not diminish the value of David's election and the Davidic covenant. Of the four references in 1 Chronicles 28 and 29 of God's election of Solomon using the root **בָּחַר**, only one occurrence (1 Chr 28:5) concerns Solomon's kingship. The two qualifiers 'and of all my sons' and 'my son' in 1 Chr 28:5 suggests that God's election of Solomon for the kingship falls under the umbrella of God's dynastic covenant made with David.

## V. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 1:8-10

### 1. Setting

2 Chronicles begins with the Solomon narrative and *his seeking of YHWH* (וַיִּדְרֹשׁ, 2 Chr 1:5) in offering a thousand burnt offerings at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:1-6). This act of godly worship pleases YHWH and he gives Solomon an opportunity to ask for that which he wants (2 Chr 1:7). Solomon answers God in 2 Chr 1:8-10, an answer, which in v. 9, includes a reference to the Davidic covenant:

יְאֹמֶן דְּבַרְךָ עִם דָּוִיד אָבִי

Let your promise to my father David now be fulfilled!

### 2. Synoptic Comparison

The synoptic passage of 2 Chr 1:8-10 is the longer passage of 1 Kgs 3:6-9,:

1Kgs 3:6-9	2 Chr 1:8-10
<p><sup>6</sup> And Solomon said, ‘You have shown great and steadfast love to your servant my father David, because he walked before you in faithfulness, in righteousness, and in uprightness of heart toward you; and you have kept for him this great and steadfast love, and have given him a son to sit on his throne today.</p> <p><sup>7</sup> And now, O LORD my God, you have made your servant king in place of my father David, although I am only a little child; I do not know how to go out or come in. <sup>8</sup> And your servant is in the midst of the people whom you have chosen, a great people, so numerous they cannot be numbered or counted.</p> <p><sup>9</sup> Give your servant therefore an understanding mind to govern your people, able to discern between good and evil; for who can govern this your great people?’</p>	<p><sup>8</sup> Solomon said to God, ‘You have shown great and steadfast love to my father David, and have made me succeed him as king.</p> <p><sup>9</sup> O LORD God, let your promise to my father David now be fulfilled, for you have made me king over a people as numerous as the dust of the earth.</p> <p><sup>10</sup> Give me now wisdom and knowledge to go out and come in before this people, for who can rule this great people of yours?’</p>

The subordinate clauses in 1 Kgs 3:6, ‘because he walked before you...toward you’ along with the next clause which repeats the first clause of the same verse, ‘and you have kept for him this great and steadfast love’, are absent from 2 Chr 1:8. Likewise, the subordinate clause in 1 Kgs 3:7, ‘although I am only a little child’ is not present in 1 Chr 1:9, and the following clause, ‘I do not know how to go out or come in’ appears in 2 Chr 1:10 as ‘wisdom and knowledge to go out and come in’. In 2 Chr 1:9, the short close ‘you have made me king’ corresponds to 1 Kgs 3:7 and the short phrase, ‘over people as numerous as the dust of the earth’ squares with 1 Kgs 3:8. However, rather strikingly, in 1 Chr 1:9 there is a textual plus, a clause in the jussive mood, which appeals to the Davidic covenant: יֵאָמֶן דְּבַרְךָ עִם דָּוִיד אָבִי (‘Let your promise to my father David be fulfilled!’). This clause reminds us of David’s prayer in 1 Chr 17:23:

וַעֲתָה יְהוָה הִדְבָּר אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ עַל-עַבְדְּךָ וְעַל-בֵּיתוֹ יֵאָמֶן  
עַד-עוֹלָם וַעֲשֵׂה כְּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ

And now, O LORD, as for the word that you have spoken concerning  
your servant and concerning his house, let it be established forever, and  
do as you have promised.

A crucial question concerns the identification of the promise, יֵאָמֶן דְּבַרְךָ עִם דָּוִיד אָבִי in 2 Chr 1:9a. The subordinate clause that follows provides a clue to this question:

כִּי אַתָּה הִמְלַכְתָּנִי עַל-עַם רַב כַּעֲפֹר הָאָרֶץ  
For you have made me king over a people as numerous as the dust of  
the earth. (2 Chr 1:9b)

It is often asserted that since 2 Chr 1:9b points to the fulfillment of the kingship promise, the desire expressed in the jussive clause, יֵאָמֶן דְּבַרְךָ עִם דָּוִיד אָבִי concerns the building of the Temple.<sup>215</sup> This view putatively gains textual support

---

<sup>215</sup> Curtis & Madsen, *The Books of Chronicles*, 317; Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 196, Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, 161; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 230; Hill, *1 & 2 Chronicles*, 381.

from 1 Chr 17:12 and 1 Chr 22:10 where both Solomon's kingship and his building of the Temple are foretold:

He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. (1 Chr 17:12)

He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever. (1 Chr 22:10)

However, 2 Chr 6:17, which is markedly closer to 2 Chr 1:9a, is a decisive key in identifying the promise of 2 Chr 1:9a in a different way:

עֲתָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים יֵאָמֵן דְּבָרְךָ עִם דָּוִיד אָבִי (2 Chr 1:9a)  
וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יֵאָמֵן דְּבָרְךָ אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ לְעַבְדְּךָ  
לְדָוִיד (2 Chr 6:17)

The verse prior to 2 Chr 6:17 informs us about the content of this promise (דְּבָרְךָ אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ לְעַבְדְּךָ לְדָוִיד):

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him, saying, 'There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me'. (2 Chr 6:16)

In this prayer of Solomon, the promise is identified as the continuation of the Davidic dynasty from generation to generation with the condition of obedience. This identification of the promise also fits the reading of 2 Chr 1:9a. When we apply this to 2 Chr 1:9, we may suggest that Solomon wishes, as the first successor of the Davidic kingship according to the Davidic covenant, that the Davidic kingly line should never fail. That is to say, Solomon's enthronement is a partial fulfillment of the Davidic covenant (2 Chr 1:9b), and the continuation of the Davidic kingdom completes the Davidic covenant (2 Chr 1:9a). Considering the postexilic time when the Israelites were still under a foreign power, this reading gains more support. The Chronicler

conveys his desire for the resurgence of the Davidic dynasty in the clause,  
 יֵאָמֵן דְּבָרְךָ עִם דָּוִיד אָבִי. In fact, as well as 2 Chr 6:16-17, 1 Chr 17:23, another  
 passage with textual affinity to 2 Chr 1:9, also buttresses this reading:

And now, O LORD, as for the word that you have spoken concerning  
 your servant and concerning his house, *let it be established forever*  
 (יֵאָמֵן עַד-עוֹלָם).

Thus, the jussive clause יֵאָמֵן עַד-עוֹלָם would appear to refer to the continuation of  
 the Davidic dynasty rather than the construction of the Temple.

However, a number of scholars have argued that Solomon's request of wisdom  
 and knowledge in v. 10 is directly related to his completion of the Temple, and this  
 request ought to lead us to identify the promise in 2 Chr 1:9 as referring to the  
 completion of the Temple.<sup>216</sup> Thus, for example, McKenzie asserts that the wisdom  
 'to go out and come in' (וְאֵצְאָה לְפָנֵי הָעַם-הַזֶּה וְאֵבֹאָה) lit 'and I may go out  
 and come in before this people') in 2 Chr 1:10 is referring to Solomon's leadership for  
 the construction of the Temple. However, he does not explain why 'wisdom and  
 knowledge to go out and come in' should refer specifically to the wisdom required for  
 the Temple construction.<sup>217</sup> In fact, the text states that 'wisdom and knowledge' are  
 for judgment during Solomon's reign:

Give me now wisdom and knowledge to go out and come in before this  
 people, for *who can rule* (מִי יִשְׁפֹּט) this great people of yours? (2 Chr  
 1:10)

In a similar vein to McKenzie, Riley claims that Solomon asks God for  
 wisdom and knowledge in 2 Chr 1:10 in order to complete the project of Temple  
 construction. In order to substantiate his argument, he refers to 2 Chr 2:11 (12):<sup>218</sup>

<sup>216</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 85; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 230; Hill, *1 & 2 Chronicles*, 381.

<sup>217</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 230.

<sup>218</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 85. Elsewhere in the same monograph (p. 173) Riley contradicts his view saying that the promise of 2 Chr 1:9 is about the establishment of the dynasty, but he regards the dynastic promise as narrated past and ignores its importance in Chronicles. However, if

Huram also said, ‘Blessed be the LORD God of Israel, who made heaven and earth, who has given King David a wise son, endowed with discretion and understanding, who will build a temple for the LORD, and a royal palace for himself’.

There is no doubt that Solomon’s wisdom in 2 Chr 2:11 (12) is for the Temple project, as Hiram states in reply to Solomon’s request for the necessary materials and skilled men. However, the text of 2 Chr 1:10 lacks this connection between wisdom and Temple building, while explicitly stating that the wisdom Solomon seeks is to enable him to judge his people.

### 3. Conclusion

At the beginning of the Solomon narrative, the Chronicler inserts the Davidic covenant, ‘Let your promise to my father David now be fulfilled!’ (2 Chr 1:9a) in the midst of the remarkable textual minuses apparent through synoptic comparison.

Judging from its close textual affinity with 2 Chr 6:17 and 1 Chr 17:23, the promise being referred to here does not relate to the completion of the Temple; rather it concerns the continuation of the Davidic dynasty through Solomon. Though some argue that the promise points to the Temple building project by viewing the wisdom Solomon requests in 2 Chr 1:10 as wisdom for Temple building, textual evidence does not support this view. Rather, the text unequivocally states that Solomon desires wisdom for the purpose of ruling the people of Israel. The prominent plus in the jussive phrase within Solomon’s prayer reveals the Chronicler’s own cry for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom when the Israelites were still under foreign rule in the postexilic period.

---

the dynastic promise is simply narrated past without carrying the Chronicler’s intention, a question remains as to why the Chronicler includes this dynastic promise in the midst of the noticeable minuses in comparison with the synoptic text, 1 Kgs 3:6-8.



## VI. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 6:3-17, 40-42

### 1. Setting

Solomon's setting of the ark of the covenant in the newly constructed Temple, as recorded in 2 Chronicles 5, and his dedication prayer in 2 Chronicles 6 constitute high points within the Chronicler's narrative. The priests, along with the Levites, praise YHWH following the laying of the ark in the most holy place (יְדִבְיִר) of the Temple. YHWH responds to them through his presence in a cloud (2 Chronicles 5). In this august moment, Solomon makes a dedicatory declaration to YHWH: 'I have built you an exalted house, a place for you to reside in forever' (2 Chr 6:2). Then, in 2 Chr 6:3-11, Solomon turns to the assembly of Israel to bless them and delivers an address followed by a prayer of dedication in 2 Chr 6:12-42. The Davidic covenant is present in both Solomon's address to the assembly and his dedication prayer in vv. 6, 10, 15, 16-17, and 42. In particular, the Davidic covenant is located at the beginning (vv. 12-17) and the end (vv. 40-42) of the dedication prayer and thereby creates a chiasmic structure for the prayer. The organization of the dedication into the introduction (vv. 12-17), main body (vv. 18-39), and conclusion (vv. 40-42) is unequivocal. Solomon praises God for his faithfulness to his promise in the introduction, and he invokes God's salvation and steadfast love in the conclusion. In the middle section, Solomon appeals to God to listen to prayers in or toward the Temple in various difficult situations such as war, famine, and plague. As the theme of the Davidic covenant is proclaimed through the mouths of prophet and king in 1 Chronicles 17, 22, 28, 2 Chronicles 1, the royal promise is found in the mouth of King Solomon in 2 Chronicles 6.

### 2. Synoptic Comparison

Solomon's address to the assembly of Israel and his prayer of Temple dedication in 2 Chr 6:3-42 agrees almost verbatim with its synoptic portion in 1 Kgs 8:14-53 except in a few noteworthy places.

2. 1. 1 Kgs 8:16//2 Chr 6:5-6

The first remarkable difference in relation to the Davidic covenant is seen between 2 Chr 6:5-6 and 1 Kgs 8:16:

מִן־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִי אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרַיִם  
לֹא־בָחַרְתִּי בְּעִיר מִכָּל שְׁבִטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְבִנוֹת בַּיִת לַהֲיִיּוֹת  
שְׁמִי שָׁם וְאֶבְחַר בְּדָוִד לַהֲיִיּוֹת עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Since the day that I brought my people Israel out of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, that my name might be there; but I chose David to be over my people Israel. (1 Kgs 8:16)

מִן־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִי אֶת־עַמִּי מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לֹא־בָחַרְתִּי  
בְּעִיר מִכָּל שְׁבִטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְבִנוֹת בַּיִת לַהֲיִיּוֹת שְׁמִי שָׁם  
וְלֹא־בָחַרְתִּי בְּאִישׁ לַהֲיִיּוֹת נָגִיד עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל  
וְאֶבְחַר בִּירוּשָׁלַם לַהֲיִיּוֹת שְׁמִי שָׁם וְאֶבְחַר בְּדָוִד לַהֲיִיּוֹת  
עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל<sup>6</sup>

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, so that my name might be there, *and I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel;*<sup>6</sup> *but I have chosen Jerusalem in order that my name may be there,* and I have chosen David to be over my people Israel. (2 Chr 6:5-6)

There are two notable differences between these passages. First, 1 Kgs 8:16's אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרַיִם corresponds to מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם in 2 Chr 6:5a. In 2 Chr 6:5, while אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל, the specification of אֶת־עַמִּי, is absent, the longer מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם corresponds to the shorter מִמִּצְרַיִם of 1 Kgs 8:16. The second important difference, which is more pertinent for our discussion, is the plus of two clauses, 5b-6a, in Chronicles, which are not present in 1 Kings 16:

וְלֹא־בָחַרְתִּי בְּאִישׁ לַהֲיִיּוֹת נָגִיד עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל  
וְאֶבְחַר בִּירוּשָׁלַם לַהֲיִיּוֹת שְׁמִי שָׁם

Many scholars explain this difference by *homoiooteleuton* (identical ending); the copyist of MT Kings seems to pass over the phrase due to the double occurrences

of the phrase **לְהִיּוֹת שְׁמִי שָׁמָּה**.<sup>219</sup> The correspondence between fragment 7 of 4QKgs and 2 Chr 6:5-6 supports this view. Though all the letters are not preserved in fragment 7 of 4QKgs, the remaining letters are enough to prove the existence of the parallel clauses of 2 Chr 6:5b-6a in 1 Kgs 8:16 of 4QKgs.<sup>220</sup> In support of the phenomenon of *homoioteleuton* in 1 Kgs 8:16 (MT), Emanuel Tov points out the abruptness of the passage, viz., the election of David takes place where the election of Jerusalem is expected.<sup>221</sup>

Looking at 1 Kgs 8:16 and 2 Chr 6:5-6 in the LXX, Lemke contends that the text of 2 Chr 6:5-6 (MT) is superior not only to the text of 1 Kgs 8:16 (MT) but also to the LXX texts of 2 Chr 6:5-6 and 1 Kgs 8:16 (3 Kgdms 8:16):<sup>222</sup>

ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας ἐξήγαγον τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου οὐκ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν πόλει ἐν ἐνὶ σκῆπτρῳ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον τοῦ εἶναι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἶναι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐξελεξάμην τὸν Δαυιδ τοῦ εἶναι ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραὴλ.

Since the day that I brought my people Israel out of Egypt, I have not chosen in a city, in one scepter of Israel, to build a house for my name to be there, but I chose in Ierousalem for my name to be there, and I chose Daudid to be over my people Israel. (3 Kgdms 8:16)

ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἀνήγαγον τὸν λαόν μου ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου οὐκ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν πόλει ἀπὸ πασῶν φυλῶν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον τοῦ εἶναι ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν ἀνδρὶ τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν μου Ἰσραὴλ <sup>6</sup> καὶ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν Δαυιδ ὥστε εἶναι ἐπάνω τοῦ λαοῦ μου Ἰσραὴλ

From the day when I brought my people up out of Egypt, I did not choose for a city out of all the tribes of Israel to build a house that my name be there, and I did not choose for a man to be leader over my people Israel. <sup>6</sup> and I have chosen for Daudid to be over my people Israel. (2 Chr 6:5-6)

<sup>219</sup> For example, Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 238-239; Lemke, "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History," 97; Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 588; Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 216; Thompson, *1, 2 Chronicles*, 227; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 246; Kjell Hognessius, *The Text of 2 Chronicles 1-16*, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 51 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003), 102-103.

<sup>220</sup> Julio Trebolle Barrera, "4QKgs," *Qumran Cave 4 IX*, DJD XIV, 177; Julio Trebolle Barrera, "A preliminary Edition of 4QKings (4Q54)," *The Madrid Qumran Congress I* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 229-246.

<sup>221</sup> Tov, 239.

<sup>222</sup> Lemke, "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History," 97

The texts of 1 Kgs 8:16 (LXX) and 2 Chr 6:5-6 (LXX) are not as complete as the text of 2 Chr 6:5-6 (MT).<sup>223</sup> 1 Kgs 8:16 (LXX) lacks 2 Chr 6:5b (MT; ‘and I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel’) and 2 Chr 6:5-6 (LXX) is missing 2 Chr 6:6a (MT; ‘but I have chosen Jerusalem in order that my name may be there’).<sup>224</sup>

Preserving the entire *Vorlage*, the Chronicler seems to highlight the significance of God’s election of David by the literary device of antithesis.<sup>225</sup> The Chronicler suggests that God’s choice of David for the kingship of Israel is special because God has never chosen a man (וְלֹא־בְחַרְתִּי בְּאִישׁ) to be ruler (נָגִיד) of Israel before. By contrasting the negative clause (וְלֹא־בְחַרְתִּי בְּאִישׁ) with God’s choice of David, the Chronicler maximizes the significance of the divine choice of David for kingship.

## 2. 2. 1 Kgs 8:21//2 Chr 6:11

The next noticeable divergence is observed in 1 Kgs 8:21 and 2 Chr 6:11:

There I have provided a place for the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with our ancestors *when he brought them out of the land of Egypt* (בְּהוֹצִיאֹ אֶת־אֲתָם מִמִּצְרָיִם). (1 Kgs 8:21)

There I have set the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with the people of Israel. (2 Chr 6:11)

In this case, contrary to the case of 2 Chr 6:5-6, the Chronicler’s text is shorter than 1 Kgs 8:21. Compared to 1 Kgs 8:21, the subordinate clause, בְּהוֹצִיאֹ אֶת־אֲתָם מִמִּצְרָיִם is absent in 2 Chr 6:11. Also, the mentions of ‘the Exodus from Egypt’ in 1 Kgs 8:51 and 1 Kgs 8:53 are not present in the corresponding text of 2

<sup>223</sup> Ibid.

<sup>224</sup> While the LXX<sup>B</sup> lacks 2 Chr 6:6a as Lemke states, other versions, such as LXX<sup>O</sup>, LXX<sup>L</sup>, LXX<sup>R</sup> include a clause, καὶ ἐξελέξαμην ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ γενέσθαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ (And I have chosen for Jerusalem for my name be there). See Leslie C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles II* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 56.

<sup>225</sup> For the Chronicler’s literary device of antithesis see Isaac Kalimi’s *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 325-349.

Chr 6:39-42.<sup>226</sup> As dealt with previously, the lack of ‘the Exodus from Egypt’ occurring in Chronicles is not due to the suppression of the Mosaic-Sinai covenant in order to magnify the Davidic covenant.<sup>227</sup> In 2 Chronicles 6, not only does the Chronicler retain the mention of ‘the Exodus from Egypt’ (v.5), he also leaves the more direct mention of the Mosaic-Sinai covenant in the phrase, **הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר-שָׁם בְּרִית יְהוָה** (v.11). If the Chronicler excluded any mention of the Exodus out of Egypt in order to suppress the Mosaic-Sinai covenant, he would have excluded the whole of v. 11. Though the Chronicler views the Davidic covenant as more vital than the Mosaic covenant, he also embraces the Mosaic-Sinai covenant as being still in force.

## 2. 3. 1 Kgs 8:22-23//2 Chr 6:13

The next conspicuous divergence from 1 Kings 8 is the plus of 2 Chr 6:13, which is missing from 1 Kgs 8:22-23:

Solomon had made *a bronze platform* (**פִּיּוֹר נְחֹשֶׁת**) five cubits long, five cubits wide, and three cubits high, and had set it in *the outer court* (**הָעֶזְרָה**); and he stood on it. Then he knelt on his knees in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands toward heaven. (2 Chr 6:13, my translation)

The **פִּיּוֹר נְחֹשֶׁת** (‘platform of bronze’) in v. 13 is a temporary podium structure located in the **עֶזְרָה** (‘outer court’), which is not in the list of the Temple furnishings in 2 Chronicles 4.<sup>228</sup> 2 Chr 6:13 could either be a plus in 2 Chronicles 6 or a minus in 1 Kings 8. In favour of it being a plus, it is argued that the Chronicler added v. 13 lest

<sup>226</sup> 1 Kgs 8:51 - ‘For they are your people and heritage, which you brought out of Egypt, from the midst of the iron-smelter’, 1 Kgs 8:53 - ‘For you have separated them from among all the peoples of the earth, to be your heritage, just as you promised through Moses, your servant, when you brought our ancestors out of Egypt, O Lord GOD’.

<sup>227</sup> See pp. 19-27 of this work.

<sup>228</sup> **פִּיּוֹר** in 2 Chr 6:13 is different from **פִּיּוֹר** in 2 Chr 4:6, which refers to a washing basin. See ‘פִּיּוֹר’ in *HALOT* I, 472.

King Solomon should stand before the sacred altar of v. 12.<sup>229</sup> J. Wellhausen states that the king's presence before the altar is unlawful without providing any evidence for his assertion.<sup>230</sup> However, this argument is weak because in v. 12, Solomon does stand before the altar:

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the LORD in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel.

If the Chronicler added v. 13 with a view to expunging the scene of Solomon's standing before the altar, the Chronicler would surely have deleted v. 12 first before adding v. 13. In fact, Solomon's standing before the altar is not illegitimate nor should it be cited to indicate the Chronicler's loose view on the holiness of the priestly duty. The Chronicler states unequivocally in the genealogy of Levi the holiness of the role played by Levites and priests:

And their kindred the Levites were appointed for all the service of the tabernacle of the house of God. But Aaron and his sons made offerings on the altar of burnt offering and on the altar of incense, doing all the work of the most holy place, to make atonement for Israel, according to all that Moses the servant of God had commanded. (1 Chr 6:33-34 (48-49))

In addition, the Chronicler underscores the significance of the priestly role through the mouth of King Abijah speaking against Jeroboam and the northern Israel:

But as for us, the LORD is our God, and we have not abandoned him. We have priests ministering to the LORD who are descendants of Aaron, and Levites for their service. They offer to the LORD every morning and every evening burnt offerings and fragrant incense, set out the rows of bread on the table of pure gold, and care for the golden lampstand so that its lamps may burn every evening; for we keep the charge of the LORD our God, but you have abandoned him. (2 Chr 13:10-11)

---

<sup>229</sup> J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 186; Curtis & Madsen, *The Books of Chronicles*, 342.

<sup>230</sup> Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 186.

Another suggested explanation for the synoptic discrepancy of 2 Chr 6:13 is the Deuteronomist's omission of the passage of 2 Chr 6:13 from his *Vorlage* due to *homoioteleuton*.<sup>231</sup> The end of 1 Kgs 8:22 is almost identical with that of 2 Chr 6:13:

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the LORD *in the presence of all the assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands to heaven* (נָגַד  
(כָּל-קְהֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּפְרֹשׂ כַּפָּיו הַשָּׁמַיִם) (1 Kgs 8:22)

Then he knelt on his knees *in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands toward heaven* (נָגַד כָּל-קְהֵל  
(יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּפְרֹשׂ כַּפָּיו הַשָּׁמַיִמָּה) (2 Chr 6:13b)

The last seven words in the two passages are identical save for the existence of the directional הַ, attached to the last word of 2 Chr 6:13b, הַשָּׁמַיִמָּה. Positing the supposed placing of 2 Chr 6:13 between 1 Kgs 8:22 and 1 Kgs 8:23, it is argued that the Deuteronomist missed the intervening section in his *Vorlage* and went directly to 1 Kgs 8:23 due to the very similar ending (*homoioteleuton*). However, although the endings of 1 Kgs 8:22 and 2 Chr 6:13 are similar, they are not the same as seen above. Thus, strictly speaking, it is not a case of *homoioteleuton*. A meticulous Hebrew scribe would surely notice the difference between הַשָּׁמַיִם and הַשָּׁמַיִמָּה. Moreover, if we compare 1 Kgs 8:22 with its parallel text 2 Chr 6:12, we can observe the Chronicler's manipulation of the text of 1 Kgs 8:22:

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the LORD *in the presence of all the assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands to heaven* (נָגַד  
(כָּל-קְהֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּפְרֹשׂ כַּפָּיו הַשָּׁמַיִם) (1 Kgs 8:22)

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the LORD *in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands* (נָגַד כָּל-קְהֵל  
(יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּפְרֹשׂ כַּפָּיו) (2 Chr 6:12)

<sup>231</sup> Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 213; Lemke, "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History," 99-100; Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1987), 48; Hognesius, 104-105.

Though the Chronicler follows 1 Kgs 8:22, he markedly omits **הַשָּׁמַיִם** moving it from v. 12 to the end of v. 13, which is his addition, before the beginning of Solomon's prayer.

Another piece of evidence for the Chronicler's addition of 2 Chr 6:13 is the postexilic term, **עֲזָרָה** ('outer court') corresponding to the earlier and more popular term, **חֲצֵר** ('court').<sup>232</sup> The use of **עֲזָרָה** as the outer court of the Temple is witnessed only here and in 2 Chr 4:9 in the Old Testament.

What, then, is the purpose of the Chronicler's interpolation of 2 Chr 6:13? The Chronicler places Solomon on a podium in the centre of the assembly of Israel so that the whole assembly of Israel may see Solomon and hear the following dedication prayer better, as 2 Chr 6:13a implies:

For Solomon made a bronze platform and placed it *in the midst of the outer court* (**בְּתוֹךְ הָעֲזָרָה**).

Solomon's standing place in 2 Chr 6:13 is different from that in 2 Chr 6:12 ('And he stood before the altar of YHWH'). Verse 12 is situated in the inner court of the priests (**חֲצֵר הַכֹּהֲנִים**), but v. 13 takes place in the outer court (**הָעֲזָרָה הַגְּדוֹלָה**), a space intended for laity.<sup>233</sup> By the addition of v. 13, the Chronicler moves Solomon to a place that is near to the *whole* assembly of Israel.

#### 2. 4. 1 Kgs 8:52-53//2 Chr 6:40-42

The Chronicler's record of the end of Solomon's dedication prayer in 2 Chr 6:40-42 is remarkably different from its parallel text 1 Kgs 8:52-53:

1 Kgs 8:52-53	2 Chr 6:40-42
<sup>52</sup> Let your eyes be open to the plea of your servant, and to the plea of your people Israel, listening to them whenever they call to you.	<sup>40</sup> Now, O my God, let your eyes be open and your ears attentive to prayer from this place.

<sup>232</sup> Mark F. Rooker, "עֲזָרָה," in *NIDOTT* III, 379-380.

<sup>233</sup> 2 Chr 4:9a witnesses the division of the two courts, 'He made the court of the priests (**חֲצֵר הַכֹּהֲנִים**), and the great court (**הָעֲזָרָה הַגְּדוֹלָה**)'.



<p><sup>53</sup> For you have separated them from among all the peoples of the earth, to be your heritage, just as you promised through Moses, your servant, when you brought our ancestors out of Egypt, O Lord GOD.</p>	<p><sup>41</sup> Now rise up, O LORD God, and go to your resting place, you and the ark of your might. Let your priests, O LORD God, be clothed with salvation, and let your faithful rejoice in your goodness. <sup>42</sup> O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one. Remember your steadfast love for your servant David.</p>
---	---

2 Chr 6:40 is shorter than 1 Kgs 8:52. While in 2 Chr 6:40 Solomon invokes God to listen to the prayer from the Temple, in 1 Kgs 8:52 he asks God to listen to the plea of his people whenever they call to Him. After 2 Chr 6:40, unlike 1 Kgs 8:53, the Chronicler appears to use passages from Ps 132:8-10 and Isa 55:3 as his source material.<sup>234</sup> Whereas Solomon refers to God's promise through Moses in 1 Kgs 8:53, the Chronicler shows Solomon turning to God's promise through David in 2 Chr 6:42.

Ps 132:8-10, 1, 16; Isa 55:3	2 Chr 6:41-42
<p>Ps 132  <sup>8</sup> Rise up, O LORD, and go to your resting place, you and the ark of your might. <sup>9</sup> Let your priests be clothed with righteousness, and let your faithful shout for joy. <sup>10</sup> For your servant David's sake do not turn away the face of your anointed one.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> O LORD, <i>remember</i> (זָכוֹר) in David's favor all the hardships he endured;</p> <p><sup>16</sup> Its priests I will clothe with <i>salvation</i>, and its faithful will shout for joy.</p> <p>Isa 55  <sup>3b</sup> I will make with you an everlasting covenant, <i>my steadfast, sure love for David</i>. (italics added)</p>	<p><sup>41</sup> Now rise up, O LORD God, and go to your resting place, you and the ark of your might. Let your priests, O LORD God, be clothed with <i>salvation</i>, and let your faithful rejoice in your goodness. <sup>42</sup> O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one(s).<sup>235</sup></p> <p><i>Remember (זָכוֹר) your steadfast love for your servant David.</i> (italics added)</p>

As the above comparison reveals, the Chronicler takes Ps 132:8-10 as the basic framework and reshapes it with other materials such as vv. 1 and 16 from the same

<sup>234</sup> Concerning the difference between 1 Kgs 8:53 and 2 Chr 6:40-42, Auld suggests that the two texts are two independent additions to the shared text of the prayer of Solomon (1 Kgs 8:12-50a//2 Chr 6:1-39). For more details, see *Kings without Privilege*, 1-3.

<sup>235</sup> In the MT it is in plural form, מְשִׁיחֶיךָ.

Psalm and Isa 55:3.<sup>236</sup> The Chronicler, who desires to highlight the Davidic covenant in the context of Solomon's dedication of the Temple, ingeniously utilizes Psalm 132, which consists of two parts: David's oath to find a place for God in vv. 1-9 and God's oath regarding the throne for David in vv. 10-18.

נִשְׁבַּע לַיהוָה נָדָר (v. 2)  
He (David) swore to the Lord.

נִשְׁבַּע־יְהוָה לְדָוִד (v. 11)  
The LORD swore to David.

The Chronicler's citation from Ps 132 lies across these two parts. In the cited passage, the Chronicler smoothly moved from the theme of the ark to the theme of חֲסִדֵי דָוִד. After citing Ps 132:8-10, he reworked the passage at four points, all of which contribute to his focus on the Davidic covenant.

Firstly, the Chronicler alters 'righteousness' in Ps 132:9 to 'salvation' in 2 Chr 6:41. This change is not the Chronicler's own invention but is another citation from Ps 132:16, which belongs to the second part of this psalm. That is, even before the natural transition from the theme of the ark to the theme of the Davidic covenant in 2 Chr 6:42, the Chronicler takes the word תְּשׁוּעָה ('salvation') from the second part of Ps 132 which deals with the Davidic covenant. In the Chronicler's postexilic milieu, תְּשׁוּעָה in the context of the Davidic covenant could rouse up sentiments regarding the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, and the Chronicler presumably makes this alteration with that in mind.

The other three alterations to Psalm 132 carried out by the Chronicler occur in 2 Chr 6:42, where he restructures Ps 132:10 substantially:

בַּעֲבוּר דָּוִד עַבְדְּךָ אֶל-תֶּשֶׁב פָּנֵי מְשִׁיחֶךָ (Ps 132:10)

יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶל-תֶּשֶׁב פָּנֵי מְשִׁיחֶיךָ זָכְרָה לְחֲסִדֵי דָוִד (2 Chr 6:42)

<sup>236</sup> Italics indicate the Chronicler's borrowing.

Firstly, the Chronicler alters מְשִׁיחֶיךָ to the plural form, מְשִׁיחֶיךָ. Some English versions and commentators view this change as a scribal error and emend it as a singular form following Ps 132:10.<sup>237</sup> However, the plural form, ‘anointed ones’, fits well in the context as referring to both David and Solomon.<sup>238</sup> To reinforce Solomon’s petition, the Chronicler has Solomon entreat God’s favor not only for himself but also for David, the original recipient of the Davidic covenant, by using the plural form, מְשִׁיחֶיךָ.<sup>239</sup> Secondly, there is the insertion in 2 Chr 6:42 of the imperative זָכְרָה, which is probably borrowed from Ps 132:1. The Chronicler’s use of this imperative verb heightens the significance of its object, which is לְחַסְדֵי דָוִד. Thirdly, the most significant alteration in 2 Chr 6:42 is the Chronicler’s use of the phrase חַסְדֵי דָוִד, which only occurs twice in the Old Testament; here and in Isa 55:3. Considering its rareness, one can suggest that the Chronicler is likely to have borrowed this phrase from Isa 55:3:

הָטוּ אָזְנוֹכֶם וּלְכוּ אֵלַי שְׁמְעוּ וּתְחִי נַפְשְׁכֶם וְאֶכְרַתָּה לָכֶם  
בְּרִית עוֹלָם חַסְדֵי דָוִד הַנֶּאֱמָנִים

Incline your ear, and come to me; listen, so that you may live. I will  
make with you an everlasting covenant, my steadfast, sure love for  
David.

Scholars almost unanimously construe the חַסְדֵי דָוִד in Isa 55:3 as an objective genitive rather than a subjective genitive, thus suggesting the phrase refers to (God’s) steadfast love for David rather than David’s faithfulness (to God).<sup>240</sup> חַסְדֵי דָוִד,

<sup>237</sup> NRSV; NIV; NJPS; Curtis & Madsen, *The Books of Chronicles*, 345; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 584, 603-604; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 247.

<sup>238</sup> Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 51; Pancratius C. Beentjes, *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, SSN 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 174.

<sup>239</sup> Beentjes, *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, 174.

<sup>240</sup> English versions such as NRSV, NKJV, NEB, NAB, NASB, NIV, and NJPS render the phrase as an objective genitive. A. Caquot and W. A. M. Beuken attempted to argue for a subjective genitive in “Les ‘Grâces de David’ A propos d’Isaïe 55/3b,” *Semitica* 15 (1965), 45-59 and “Isa. 55, 3-5: The Reinterpretation of David,” *Bijdragen* 35 (1974), 49-64, respectively.

which is in an appositional relationship to the preceding phrase **בְּרִית עִלָּם**, refers to God's steadfast love for David in the Davidic covenant of 2 Samuel 7.<sup>241</sup>

However, scholarly opinion as to the rendering of the other occurrence of **חֲסִדֵּי דָוִד** in 2 Chr 6:42b is somewhat divided between viewing it as an objective genitive and as a subjective genitive, as the different translations of English versions show:

Subjective genitive

Remember thy servant David's loyal service (NEB)

Remember the devotion of David, your servant. (NAB)

Remember the loyalty of Your servant David. (NJPS)

Objective genitive

Remember your steadfast love for your servant David. (NRSV)

Remember Thy lovingkindness to Thy servant David. (NASB)

Remember the great love promised to David your servant. (NIV)

Among the defenders of the subjective genitive, Japhet provides the most detailed reasoning.<sup>242</sup> One can summarize her argument as follows:<sup>243</sup>

1. God's promise to David does not fit the atmosphere of the prayer's conclusion.
2. All plural forms of **חֲסִדִּים** either as constructs or with possessive pronouns are used as a subjective genitive.
3. God's steadfast love is consistently expressed by phrases such as **חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה, חֲסִדֵּי דָוִד, חֲסִדֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל**.
4. To view the phrase as an objective genitive is to force upon it a unique and exceptional usage.
5. Neh 13:14 is its close parallel: 'Remember me (**זְכֹרֵה לִי**), O my God, concerning this, and do not wipe out my good deeds (**חֲסִדֵּי**)'.

<sup>241</sup> H. G. M. Williamson, "The Sure Mercies of David: Subjective or Objective Genitive?," *JSS* 23 (1978), 41-48; Walter C. Kaiser, "The Unfailing Kindnesses Promised to David: Isa 55.3," *JSOT* 45 (1989), 94-96.

<sup>242</sup> Among the supporters of the subjective genitive are Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 604-605; Johnstone, *I & 2 Chronicles* I, 352; R. J. Coggins, *I and 2 Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 167; John C. Endres, William R. Miller, John Barclay Burns, *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts* (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 180; and McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 247.

<sup>243</sup> Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 604-605.

Also, חֲסִדֵּי in 2 Chr 32:32 and 35:26 means the ‘good deeds’ of Hezekiah and Josiah respectively.

However, these five arguments fail to provide a decisive rationale for viewing the expression as a subjective genitive. First, contra Japhet’s reasoning, the objective genitive sense, that is, ‘God’s promise to David’, does fit well within the context of the end of the prayer. In v. 42, the objective genitive of חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה matches its preceding clause, ‘O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one’. Solomon invokes God to remember the Davidic covenant to reinforce the preceding invocation. Moreover, in terms of the structure of the dedication prayer, חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה as an objective genitive constitutes an *inclusio* of the dedication prayer with its introduction in vv. 14-17, where Solomon repeatedly refers to God’s promise to David:<sup>244</sup>

He said, ‘O LORD, God of Israel, there is no God like you, in heaven or on earth, keeping covenant in steadfast love with your servants who walk before you with all their heart <sup>15</sup> you who have kept for your servant, my father David, what you promised to him. Indeed, you promised with your mouth and this day have fulfilled with your hand. <sup>16</sup> Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him, saying, “There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me”. <sup>17</sup> Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, let your word be confirmed, which you promised to your servant David’.

Japhet’s second argument loses its force when we construe חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה of Isa 55:3 as an objective genitive, for which there is broad consensus. Her third argument is rather irrelevant to the issue. The common use of God’s חֲסִד in phrases such as חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה, חֲסִדֵּיךָ, חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה would not be relevant evidence to refute the sense of objective genitive of חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה in 2 Chr 6:42. As noted in Isa 55:3, God’s loving kindness is expressed in the phrase חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה. Also her fourth argument can be challenged when we consider that the only other occurrence of חֲסִדֵּי יְהוָה in the Old Testament (Isa 55:3) carries the sense of the objective genitive; therefore, it is not forced, unique, or exceptional to propose this same sense for 2 Chr 6:42. Similar to

<sup>244</sup> De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 260; Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 221.

her third argument, Japhet's fifth argument is also extraneous to the issue. The sharing of the two words זָכַר and חָסַד in 2 Chr 6:42 and Neh 13:14 would not necessarily make these two verses close parallels, as Japhet maintains. It should not be overlooked that the occurrence of חָסַד with David carries strong covenantal import. In this sense, there is a clear distinction between the חָסַד of David and the חָסַד of Nehemiah. As a consequence, though many other forms of חָסַד either as a construct or with a pronominal suffix are dominantly rendered as subjective genitives, the particular phrase חָסַדִּי דָוִד in 2 Chr 6:42 ought to be rendered in the same way as its parallel in Isa 55:3.

In sum, the Chronicler, unlike 1 Kgs 8:53, includes Solomon's reliance upon YHWH's promise to David as given voice in Ps 132:10. He also makes the Davidic covenant explicit by altering the phrase בְּעִבּוֹר דָּוִד ('for the sake of David') of Ps 132:10 to the exhortation, זָכְרָה לְחַסְדֵּי דָוִד ('remember the loving kindness for David' viz., the Davidic covenant). The Chronicler's citation of the particular phrase חָסַדִּי דָוִד as well as his other alterations in 2 Chr 6:40-42 (i.e., the change from 'righteousness' to 'salvation', the addition of the imperative זָכְרָה, and the modification of the singular מְשִׁיחֶיךָ into the plural מְשִׁיחֶיךָ), reflect the Chronicler's longing for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty by relying on the Davidic covenant.

### 3. Further Issue: Identification of the Promises

In 2 Chr 6:3-17, Solomon refers to God's promise to David on five occasions:

And he said, 'Blessed be the LORD, the God of Israel, who with his hand has fulfilled *what he promised with his mouth* (אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּפִי) to my father David'. (v. 4)

Now the LORD has fulfilled *his promise that he made* (דִּבְרוֹ אֲשֶׁר), for I have succeeded my father David, and sit on the throne of Israel, as the LORD promised, and have built the house for the name of the LORD, the God of Israel. (v. 10)

You who have kept for your servant, my father David, *what you promised to him* (אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתָּ לוֹ). Indeed, you promised with your mouth and this day have fulfilled with your hand. (v. 15)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, *that which you promised him* (אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ לִּי), saying, ‘There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me’. (v. 16)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, let *your word* be confirmed, *which you promised to your servant David*. (דְּבַרְךָ אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ לְעַבְדְּךָ לְדָוִיד). (v. 17)

Solomon mentions ‘what God promised to David’ twice in his address to the assembly and three times in the introductory portion of his dedication prayer. To what do these promises refer? The first promise in v. 4, (אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּר בְּפִי) is commonly equated with the Temple construction.<sup>245</sup> Here, however, the promise not only refers to the Temple construction but also to the royal promise for the house of David. The last term of v. 4, לֵאמֹר (‘saying’), leads to the content of the promise in vv. 5-6:

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, so that my name might be there, and I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel;<sup>6</sup> but I have chosen Jerusalem in order that my name may be there, and I have chosen David to be over my people Israel.

The structure of vv. 5-6, ABAB (A – Temple construction, B – royal promise), informs the two-fold promise to David. The second promise in v. 10 (דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר) is self-explanatory as the following part of v. 10 identifies it as the royal promise for the Davidic family and the Temple building. The third promise in v. 15 (אֲשֶׁר-דִּבַּרְתָּ לִּי) seems to refer solely to the Temple building. Although the phraseology of v. 15 shares a common element with v. 4 (וּבִידְבַר בְּפִיךָ וּבִידְבַר) (cf. אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּר בְּפִי אֶת דָּוִיד אָבִי וּבִידְבַר בְּפִיךָ; cf. מְלֶאכֶת in v. 4), the promise in v. 15 is restricted to the fulfillment of the Temple building. Two pieces of textual evidence support this identification. First, כִּי־הַיּוֹם (‘as this day’) at the end of v. 15 connotes the day at the end of the Temple construction. Secondly, the next adverbial

<sup>245</sup> Cutis & Madsen, *The Books of Chronicles*, 341; J. M. Myers, *II Chronicles*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1965), 35; Thompson, *1,2 Chronicles*, 227.

phrase at the beginning of v. 16, וְעַתָּה, identifies the distinction between the promise in v. 15 and the fourth promise in v. 16, אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ לִּי, which is clearly God's promise concerning the Davidic throne. When God's promise of the Temple building is fulfilled, Solomon now asks God to continue to fulfill the other promise he made to David, that is, the dynastic promise. This line of transition from the fulfillment of the Temple building to the fulfillment of the royal promise militates against Riley's assertion that the need for the Davidic dynasty was gone when the Temple was completed.<sup>246</sup> Especially in the postexilic context of Chronicles, Solomon's prayer for the fulfillment of the Davidic covenant would convey the Chronicler's aspiration for the restoration of the lost kingdom of David. As with the fourth promise in v. 16, the fifth promise in v. 17 (אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ) refers to the Davidic covenant. Verse 17, which again begins with וְעַתָּה, is a confirming invocation to God for the sake of the Davidic dynasty.

In sum, out of these five promises, the first two promises in v. 4 and v. 10 refer to the promise of both the Temple building and the Davidic dynasty. The third promise in v. 15 points to the achieved promise of the Temple building, and the last two promises in vv. 16 and 17 refer to the Davidic covenant. Throughout 2 Chr 6:3-17, the Chronicler interweaves the promise of the Temple building and the promise of the royal dynasty. Acknowledging God's accomplishment of the promise of the Temple building, the Chronicler now appeals to the other divine promise and longs for the resurgence of God's chosen dynasty.

#### 4. Conclusion

Having deposited the ark of the covenant in the newly constructed Temple, Solomon mentions the Davidic covenant repeatedly in his address to the assembly of Israel (2 Chr 6:3-11) and his dedication prayer, particularly in the introduction (2 Chr 6:12-17) and in the conclusion (2 Chr 6:40-42). Although the Chronicler's text of 2 Chr 6:3-42 almost identical with its parallel text in 1 Kgs 8:14-53, some noticeable variances shed light on the Chronicler's view of the Davidic covenant.

---

<sup>246</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 179



The plus of 2 Chr 6:5b-6a is due to the Deuteronomist's omission from his *Vorlage* by *homoiooteleuton*. In the preservation of 2 Chr 6:5b-6a, the Chronicler could highlight the royal promise to David by the use of antithesis. As the direct reference to the ark of the covenant in 2 Chr 6:11 witnesses, the lack of the phrase 'the Exodus from Egypt' in 2 Chr 6:11, which is present in 1 Kgs 8:21, does not indicate the suppression of the Mosaic covenant for the sake of magnifying the Davidic covenant. Judging from the Chronicler's relocation of **הַשְּׁמִימִינָהּ** from 2 Chr 6:12 to 2 Chr 6:13 and the occurrence of the later word, **עֲזָרָהּ**, 2 Chr 6:13 is the Chronicler's addition rather than the Deuteronomist's omission by a *homoiooteleuton*. By interpolating 2 Chr 6:13, the Chronicler places Solomon in a position at which the assembly could see him and better hear his dedication prayer.

At the conclusion of the dedication prayer, the Chronicler cites Solomon's appeal to God's promise to David as found in Psalm 132:8-10 and Isa 55:3 rather than God's promise through Moses. This citation enhances the meaningfulness of the Davidic covenant in the Chronicler's time.

Solomon's repeated mentions of 'what God spoke to David' throughout his address and prayer refers to the Temple construction and the royal promise bestowed upon the Davidic family. When the first promise of the Temple building was fulfilled, Solomon turns to the second promise of the eternal dynasty of David as the repeated phrase **וַיֵּתֶן** in 2 Chr 6:16 and 2 Chr 6:17 implies. Solomon's petition for the fulfillment of the second promise carries the Chronicler's aspiration for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom.

## VII. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 7:17-22

### 1. Setting

Sacrifices and a feast (זָבַח) in 2 Chr 7:1-10 follow Solomon's dedication prayer for the Temple (2 Chr 6:12-42). The sacrifices begin with the coming of fire from heaven (2 Chr 7:1), which signals God's endorsement of Solomon's prayer. This divine endorsement continues through God's direct appearance to Solomon in 2 Chr 7:12-22. God's appearance to Solomon consists of two parts. The first portion of God's speech to Solomon in vv. 12-16 matches the main body of Solomon's dedication prayer in 2 Chr 6:18-39, in which Solomon asks for God's deliverance in manifold difficult situations. In this part, God responds to Solomon with his affirmation of help. The second part of God's speech in vv. 17-22 includes the Davidic covenant (vv. 17-18), which is the major subject of both the introduction (2 Chr 6:14-17) and conclusion (2 Chr 6:40-42) of Solomon's dedication prayer. 2 Chr 7:17-22 comprises two conditional promises given first to Solomon in vv. 17-18 and secondly to the Israelites in vv. 19-22. The singular וְאַתָּה in v. 17 and the plural אַתֶּם in v. 19 clearly reveal two sets of promises in this section.<sup>247</sup>

### 2. Synoptic Comparison

Though the text of 2 Chr 7:17-22 is similar to 1 Kgs 9:4-9 several differences reveal the Chronicler's view of the Davidic covenant in his postexilic milieu. Comparing the conditional promise to Solomon in 2 Chr 7:17-18 with that of 1 Kgs 9:4-5, two differences between 2 Chr 7:18 and 1 Kgs 9:5 are suggestive of the Chronicler's thoughts: the Chronicler's use of כָּרְתִי (cf., דִּבַּרְתִּי in 1 Kgs 9:5) and his use of the phrase, מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל (cf., כָּסָא יִשְׂרָאֵל in 1 Kgs 9:5).

וְהִקְמַתִּי אֶת-כָּסָא מִמְּלִכְתְּךָ עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעַלְמָם כַּאֲשֶׁר  
דִּבַּרְתִּי עַל-דָּוִד אָבִיךָ לֵאמֹר לֹא-יִכָּרֵת לְךָ אִישׁ מֵעַל כָּסָא

<sup>247</sup> These two sets of promises are reminiscent of 1 Chr 28:2-10, where David makes charges to the corporate assembly of Israel in vv. 2-8 and to the individual, Solomon, in vv. 9-10. Whereas David's charge to Solomon is located after the corporate charge in 1 Chr 28:2-10, the conditional promise to Solomon is placed before the promise to the Israelites in the divine speech of 2 Chr 7:17-22.

יִשְׂרָאֵל

Then I will establish the throne of your kingdom over Israel forever, as *I spoke* unto David, your father, saying, ‘A man *upon the throne of Israle* shall not be cut off for you’. (1 Kgs 9:5, my translation)

וְהָקִמּוֹתִי אֶת כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתְךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר כָּרַתִּי לְדָוִיד אָבִיךָ  
לֵאמֹר לֹא-יִכָּרֵת לְךָ אִישׁ מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל

Then I will establish the throne of your kingdom as *I covenanted* with David, your father saying, ‘A man *ruling in Israel* shall not be cut off for you’. (2 Chr 7:18, my translation)

The Chronicler’s choice of the term, כָּרַתִּי in 2 Chr 7:18 emphasizes the importance of the Davidic covenant for the postexilic Israelite community.<sup>248</sup> Without a doubt, the strong covenantal term כָּרַת reveals that the Davidic covenant has not expired but is still valid for the time of the Chronicler who hopes for the restoration of the lost kingdom of David based on this eternal covenant. Riley, however, claims that the Chronicler’s use of כָּרַת does not have to do with his desire for the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom:

The reading כָּרַתִּי in 2 Chr 7:18 may, in fact, indicate a stronger concern with the covenantal nature of the word to David, but the restoration of the Davidic dynasty only follows if such a dynastic promise is interpreted by the Chronicler to apply even after the long interruption which began in the sixth century; it should be also be noted that this word כָּרַתִּי has been introduced into a conditioned context (2 Chr 7:17-18).<sup>249</sup>

However, Riley’s two-fold explanation fails to repress the Chronicler’s aspiration for the revival of the Davidic dynasty. His first point, the interruption of the kingdom, would not be an obstacle for the Chronicler’s reemphasis on the Davidic covenant. As

<sup>248</sup> Rudolph presumes a scribal error with regard to this discrepancy (*Chronikbücher*, 217), but considering the different number of characters, this is less likely. Another explanation for the difference is to make a wordplay between כָּרַתִּי and יָכַרַת in the latter part of the same verse (Thompson, *1,2 Chronicles*, 236). As Thompson maintains, by using the term כָּרַתִּי, the Chronicler would have achieved two purposes; intensification of the Davidic covenant and wordplay. The Chronicler’s use of כָּרַת in the context of the Davidic covenant is also noted in 2 Chr 21:7a: ‘Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David because of the covenant that he had made with David (הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת לְדָוִיד)’.

<sup>249</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 172-173.

analyzed previously, for the Chronicler, the eternal promise of the Davidic dynasty could have lacunae, such as periods of God's punishment, but when the retribution ends, the Israelites could hope for the restoration of the kingdom based on the eternal covenant.<sup>250</sup> His second point, כְּרָתִי in a conditioned context, does not necessarily imply any weakening of hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingship. As discussed previously, in Chronicles, the conditional and unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant form an organic relationship with each other.<sup>251</sup> Here, the Chronicler does not suggest that the Davidic covenant does not mean anything in the postexilic era because the Israelites did not meet the divine condition; rather, he is suggesting that God would revisit the Israelites, who paid for their sins through the exile, based on the unconditional facet of the Davidic covenant.

Besides the Chronicler's use of כְּרָתִי, his choice of the phrase, מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל in 2 Chr 7:18 strengthens the meaningfulness of the Davidic covenant for postexilic Israelites. This rests on the understanding of the phrase מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל as borrowed from Mic 5:1 (2), which prophesies the restorer:

But you, O Bethlehem of Ephrathah, who are one of the little clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one *ruling in Israel* (מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל), whose origin is from of old, from ancient days. (my translation)

Since Mic 5:1 (2) is the only other place where the phrase מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל occurs in the Old Testament, one can presume that the Chronicler borrowed the phrase in order to express his longing for the restorer of Israel. By taking the established future-looking phrase מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, the Chronicler connotes his hope for a resurgence of Davidic rule. Riley maintains the opposite, however, noting that the phrase מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל might be original to the Chronicler's *Vorlage*.<sup>252</sup> Having noted the agreement between מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל of 2 Chr 7:18 in the MT and ἡγούμενος ἐν

---

<sup>250</sup> See pp. 39-42 of this work.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid.

<sup>252</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 173.

Ἰσραηλ ('Ruling in Israel') of 1 Kgs 9:5 in the LXX, Riley reckons

יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל כֶּסֶּא of 1 Kgs 9:5 in the MT to be a corruption:

οὐκ ἐξαρθήσεται σοι ἀνὴρ ἡγούμενος ἐν Ἰσραηλ.

There shall not be taken from you a man ruling in Israel. (3 Kgdms 9:5b, my translation)

However, although it is theoretically possible that יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל כֶּסֶּא of 1 Kgs 9:5 in the MT is a corruption and בִּישְׂרָאֵל מוֹשֵׁל is original, it seems unlikely. Whereas there is no occurrence of בִּישְׂרָאֵל מוֹשֵׁל throughout the MT of Samuel-Kings, מֵעַל כֶּסֶּא (מֵעַל) occurs six more times in addition to 1 Kgs 9:5 (1 Kgs 2:4; 8:20, 25; 10:9; 2 Kgs 10:30; 15:12).<sup>253</sup> This statistic indicates the Deuteronomist's familiarity with the phrase מֵעַל כֶּסֶּא יִשְׂרָאֵל, and suggests the originality of מֵעַל כֶּסֶּא יִשְׂרָאֵל in 1 Kgs 9:5 of the MT. By introducing the phrase בִּישְׂרָאֵל מוֹשֵׁל, the Chronicler perhaps effects a word play with מוֹשֵׁל between מוֹשֵׁל and מָשָׁל ('proverb') of 2 Chr 7:20, as he already used a pun on כֶּרֶת between כֶּרֶתִּי and יִכְרֶת in 2 Chr 7:18:

וְהָקִימוֹתִי אֶת כֶּסֶּא מְלָכוּתְךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר כָּרַתִּי לְדָוִיד אָבִיךָ  
לֵאמֹר לֹא־יִכְרֹת לְךָ אִישׁ מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל

Then I will establish the throne of your kingdom as *I covenanted* with David, your father saying, 'A man *ruling* in Israel *shall not be cut off* for you'. (2 Chr 7:18, my translation)

וְנִתְּשָׁתִּים מֵעַל אֲדָמָתִי אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לָהֶם וְאֶת־הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה  
אֲשֶׁר הִקְדַּשְׁתִּי לְשְׁמִי אֲשַׁלֵּיךְ מֵעַל פָּנַי וְאֶתְּנֶנּוּ לְמָשָׁל  
וּלְשִׁנְיָנָה בְּכָל־הָעַמִּים

Then I will pluck you up from the land that I have given you; and this house, which I have consecrated for my name, I will cast out of my sight, and will make it a *proverb* and a byword among all peoples. (2 Chr 7:20)

### 3. Conclusion

The synoptic comparison between 2 Chr 7:17-18 and 1 Kgs 9:4-5 reveals that the Chronicler reinforces the Davidic covenant in his postexilic milieu. The

<sup>253</sup> Cf., מוֹשֵׁל occurs in 1 Kgs 5:1//2 Chr 9:26

Chronicler's use of the strong covenantal term כְּרִיתִי and the well known phrase for restoration, מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל of Mic 5:1(2) reflect the Chronicler's desire for the resurgence of the Davidic dynasty based on the Davidic covenant. Some attempts to deny the plain textual indications have been examined and found wanting.

## VIII. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 13:1-22

### 1. Setting

2 Chronicles 13 is significant for our understanding of the Chronicler's view of the Davidic covenant because it includes the speech of Abijah, the Judahite king, against Israel's king Jeroboam and the Israelites, who rebelled against Davidic descendant, Rehoboam. The Davidic covenant is addressed through the mouth of Abijah in 2 Chr 13:5. Since Abijah's speech is the Chronicler's *Sondergut*, it helps us understand the Chronicler's own ideology. 1 Kgs 15:1-8, the corresponding passage of 2 Chr 13:1-23, does not have this long speech or the following narrative of the battle between Judah and Israel.

### 2. Synoptic Comparison

There are several points of difference between the two synoptic texts. In terms of length, the narrative concerning Abijah/m<sup>254</sup> is approximately three times longer in 2 Chr 13:1-23 than the corresponding 1 Kgs 15:1-8 passage. The Chronicler's inclusion of Abijah's speech in vv. 4b-12 and the subsequent battle narrative between Abijah and Jeroboam in vv. 13-21 renders the Chronicler's account three times longer than the Abijah narrative of 1 Kgs 15:1-8. On the other hand, the text of 1 Kgs 15:3-5 does not exist in the Chronicler's Abijah account.

In the light of the Chronicler's ideology on the Davidic dynasty, it is pivotal to perceive how the Chronicler portrays Abijah, the advocate of the Davidic covenant:

Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? (2 Chr 13:5)

If the Chronicler depicts Abijah in a positive way, the validity of his speech is heightened and indicates the Chronicler's vindication of the kingship for the Davidic descendants. If the portrayal is negative then Abijah's defense of the Davidic

---

<sup>254</sup> While the name is אֲבִיָּה in 1 Kings 15, the name appears as אֲבִיָּה in 2 Chronicles 13. Hereafter, I will use Abijah to designate the king except for when I need to distinguish the two.

covenant loses weight. In Kgs 15:1-8, the Deuteronomist plainly assesses Abijah as a wicked king:

He committed all the sins that his father did before him; his heart was not true to the LORD his God, like the heart of his father David. (1 Kgs 15:3)

On the contrary, the straightforward negative evaluation of Abijah is not in Chronicles. Nevertheless, the Chronicler does not offer the same compliment to Abijah as was offered to other good kings such as Asa and Hezekiah:

Asa did what was good and right in the sight of the LORD his God. (2 Chr 14:1 (2))

He (Hezekiah) did what was right in the sight of the LORD, just as his ancestor David had done. (2 Chr 29:2)

A close reading of the text of 2 Chronicles 13 in comparison with its synoptic passage in 1 Kgs 15:1-8, reveals how the Chronicler views King Abijah.

## 2. 1. 1 Kgs 15:1//2 Chr 13:1

The first verse of each history share many common features.

Now in the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam son of Nebat, Abijah began to reign over Judah. (1 Kgs 15:1)

In the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam, Abijah began to reign over Judah. (2 Chr 13:1)

We can note two differences here. The qualifier of Jeroboam, ‘son of Nebat’ does not exist in 2 Chr 13:1, and the Chronicler uses ‘Abijah’ rather than ‘Abijam’ throughout Chronicles. It seems that the Chronicler saves the modifier, ‘son of Nebat’ and uses it later in Abijah’s speech in v. 6 to punctuate Jeroboam’s non-Davidic heritage:<sup>255</sup>

---

<sup>255</sup> The Chronicler uses the qualifier of Jeroboam, ‘son of Nebat’ only once here in 2 Chronicles 13 while ten occurrences of ‘Jeroboam’ are in 2 Chronicles 13 (vv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 13, 15, 19, 20).



Yet Jeroboam son of Nebat, a servant of Solomon son of David, rose up and rebelled against his lord.

In fact, 2 Chr 13:1 is unique in Chronicles because this is the only place where the Chronicler uses synchronism when he introduces a Judaic king.<sup>256</sup> While synchronism is common to the introduction of Judaic and northern Israelite kings in the book of Kings, it is not used at all in Chronicles with the exception of this verse. As De Vries suggests, the Chronicler uses synchronism here since the report of Abijah's reign is fully taken up with the battle against Jeroboam.<sup>257</sup> This synchronism functions as a forerunner to betraying a sharp conflict between Abijah and Jeroboam as protagonist and antagonist respectively of the narrative.

The difference between the two names, Abijam in 1 Kings 15 and Abijah in 2 Chronicles 13, may also shed some light on how the Chronicler views King Abijah.<sup>258</sup> For this intriguing variance, C. H. Gordon maintains that Abijam is older and that the Chronicler's Abijah is puritanized because he wants to remove any vestige of paganism from the theophoric name of a Davidic king.<sup>259</sup> According to Gordon, since YAM is a Canaanite sea-god, the Chronicler intentionally changed the name from YAM to YA; that is, to YHWH.<sup>260</sup> Lemke, on the other hand, opposes Gordon's assertion of a puritanical name change.<sup>261</sup> He, referring to Noth, holds that 'אַבְיָה'

---

<sup>256</sup> Synchronism is a chronological arrangement of historical events and personages so as to indicate coincidence or coexistence. In 2 Chr 13:1, the Chronicler arranges the time of Abijah's installation in light of the coexistent northern Israelite King, Jeroboam.

<sup>257</sup> De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 291.

<sup>258</sup> Cf., Αβιου (3 Kgdms 15, LXX), Αβια (2 Chr 13, LXX)

<sup>259</sup> C. H. Gordon, *Introduction to Old Testament Times* (New Jersey: Ventnor Publishers, 1953), 182.

<sup>260</sup> Michael A. Grisanti's summary of the deity YAM in the Ugaritic texts is helpful: 'Throughout the religious texts of Ugarit, El is the head of the pantheon of gods and Athirat (called 'Athirat of the sea' at times; KTU (Dietrich, M., Loretz, O., Sanmartin, J., *Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit* 1, Neukirchen, 1976), 1.4 I, 15) is his consort. Yam (the son of El), whose name literally means 'sea' and who has the titles 'Prince Sea' and 'Judge River', sends messengers to demand that the assembly of the gods deliver Baal and his powers over to himself. (KTU, 1.2 I, 30-35) After El grants Yam's request, Baal protests and sets out to battle with Yam. Using two weapons crafted by Kothar, Baal is able to slay Yam. (KTU, 1.2 IV, 11-27) In light of Athirat's (consort of Baal) exclamation, 'Our captive is Prince Yam ... our captive is Judge River' (KTU, 1.2 IV, 29-30) and Yam's reappearance later in the Baal cycle, the death of Yam apparently does not signify his ceasing to exist, but his total subordination to Baal. Uncontested sovereignty on earth and sea is determined by this battle' in 'יָם', *NIDOTT* II, 462.

<sup>261</sup> Lemke, "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History," 141-142.

does not contain any ‘sea’ element but that ‘ם’ could be a hypocoristic ending.<sup>262</sup>

Noth himself, however, does not support his assertion with satisfactory evidence. He simply suggests ‘ām’ as a hypocoristic ending from his postulation:

אֲבִיָּה: Die Lesung אֲבִיָּה (ו) in 1 Kön 14, 31 ff. und Chron. ist sekundäre Erleichterung; das zweite Element ist dunkel, hat aber mit יָם = Meer gewiß zu tun; es könnte wohl ein Gottesname darin stecken, vielleicht ist es auch nur die hypocoristische Endung –ām.<sup>263</sup>

Namely, Noth denies the connection of אֲבִיָּה to ‘sea’, but rather separates ‘יָ’ from ‘אֲבִיָּה’.

Judging from the absence of the Deuteronomist’s negative judgment against Abijah (cf. 1 Kgs 15:3) in Chronicles, it is plausible to suggest that the Chronicler puritanized Abijam to Abijah in order to remove the pagan element in the name of a Davidic descendent. It may have been uncomfortable for the Chronicler to leave the name אֲבִיָּה, which literally means ‘my father is YAM’. Although he could not ascertain how the Deuteronomist appreciated the nuance of the name Abijam, whether it is hypocoristic or adverse, the Chronicler could have read אֲבִיָּה as ‘my father is YAM, (a pagan god)’ at first glance and attempted to change the name. Thus, the noticeable discrepancy between Abijam to Abijah is probably explained by more than a simple orthographic variant; rather, the Chronicler made an intentional change in order to present this Davidic king more favorably. G. R. Driver succinctly presents this point:

The feeling of the Jews about forms in ‘yam’, which are rare in the Old Testament, is perhaps truly reflected by the compiler of Kings or his editor, in that he calls a king of whom he disapprove Abijam (1 Kgs 14:31-15:3), while the Chronicler signifies his approval of the same king by calling him Abijah or Abijahu. (2 Chr 11:20-22 and 13:1-22)<sup>264</sup>

---

<sup>262</sup> Ibid. ‘hypocoristic’ means ‘endearing’.

<sup>263</sup> M. Noth, *Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928), 234.

<sup>264</sup> G. R. Driver, “The Original Form of the Name ‘Yahweh’: Evidence and Conclusions,” ZAW 46 (1928), 13. אֲבִיָּה, a variant of אֲבִיָּה, occurs twice in 2 Chr 13:20 and 2 Chr 13:21.

## 2. 2. 1 Kgs 15:2//2 Chr 13:2

Not only is there variance in Abijah's name, there is also a discrepancy in his mother's name. In 1 Kgs 15:2, it is written, 'He reigned for three years in Jerusalem. His mother's name was Maacah (מַעַכָּה), daughter of Abishalom', while 2 Chr 13:2 states 'Three years he reigned in Jerusalem. The name of his mother is Michayahu (מִיכָיָהוּ), daughter of Uriel of Gibeah...'.<sup>265</sup>

Furthermore, the genealogy of Abijah's mother in 2 Chr 13:2 is different from that of 1 Kgs 15:2. Maacah is the daughter of Abishalom in 1 Kgs 15:2 whereas in 2 Chr 13:2, Michayahu is a daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. Interestingly 2 Chr 11:18-20 seems to agree with 1 Kgs 15:2 while disagreeing with 2 Chr 13:2:

Rehoboam took as his wife Mahalath daughter of Jerimoth son of David, and of Abihail daughter of Eliab son of Jesse. She bore him sons: Jeush, Shemariah, and Zaham. After her he took *Maacah daughter of Absalom*, who bore him Abijah, Attai, Ziza, and Shelomith. (2 Chr 11:18-20)

It is puzzling that the Chronicler identifies Abijah's mother as Maacah, daughter of Abishalom in one place and as Micayahu, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, elsewhere.

Let us therefore attempt to untangle the difficulties surrounding the name of Abijah's mother. First of all, the Chronicler's מִיכָיָהוּ in 2 Chr 13:2 seems deliberate. In the name מִיכָיָהוּ the Chronicler stresses the theological orthodoxy of Abijah's mother.<sup>265</sup> The name, Maacah carries a non-Israelite pagan association as seen in Gen 22:20-24 and 1 Kgs 2:39.<sup>266</sup>

Now after these things it was told Abraham, 'Milcah also has borne children, to your brother Nahor: Uz the firstborn, Buz his brother, Kemuel the father of Aram, Chesed, Hazo, Pildash, Jidlaph, and Bethuel'. Bethuel became the father of Rebekah. These eight Milcah bore to Nahor, Abraham's brother. Moreover, his concubine, whose

---

<sup>265</sup> Johnstone, *1 and 2 Chronicles* II, 51.

<sup>266</sup> W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), 157-158.

name was Reumah, bore Tebah, Gaham, Tahash, and *Maacah*. (Gen 22:20-24)

But it happened at the end of three years that two of Shimei's slaves ran away to King Achish son of *Maacah* of Gath. When it was told Shimei, 'Your slaves are in Gath'. (1 Kgs 2:39)

In Gen 22:24, Maacah is one of Nahor's descendants, who later became the Israelites' Aramean ancestors. Terah's son, Nahor, was married to Milcah daughter of his brother Haran<sup>267</sup> and had eight sons: Uz, Buz, Kemuel, Chesed, Hazo, Pildash, Jidlaph and Bethuel. Among these sons, Kemuel was the father of Aram, who was eponymous for the Aramean people. Between Nahor and his concubine Reumah, there were four sons: Tebah, Gaham, Tahash, and Maacah. At issue here is the pagan character of non-Israelites, which the name Maacah may invoke. That there is a distinction between the God of Abraham and the pagan God of Nahor is evident from Gen 31:53a:

May the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, the God of their father judge between us.

In the peace treaty between Laban and Jacob, Laban distinguishes the God of Abraham from the God of Nahor, who is also the God of their father, Terah. This distinction is seen more clearly in Josh 24:2-3:

And Joshua said to all the people, 'Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel: Long ago your ancestors-- Terah and his sons Abraham and Nahor-- lived beyond the Euphrates and served other gods. Then I took your father Abraham from beyond the River and led him through all the land of Canaan and made his offspring many. I gave him Isaac'.

---

<sup>267</sup> 'When Terah had lived seventy years, he became the father of Abram, Nahor, and Haran. Now these are the descendants of Terah. Terah was the father of Abram, Nahor, and Haran; and Haran was the father of Lot. Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his birth, in Ur of the Chaldeans. Abram and Nahor took wives; the name of Abram's wife was Sarai, and the name of Nahor's wife was Milcah. She was the daughter of Haran the father of Milcah and Iscah'. (Gen 11:26-29)

Here, Joshua reminds the Israelites that the gods which Terah and his sons, Abraham and Nahor, served long ago are different from the God who took Abraham from beyond the River.

In 1 Kgs 2:39, Maacah is recorded as the mother of Achish, who is a king of Gath, a major Philistine city. 1 Kgs 2:39 narrates that Shimei's two slaves ran off to Achish, son of Maacah in Gath, Philistia. In sum, the Chronicler would not use the name of Abijah's mother as Maacah, given that this name was related to an Aramean ancestor and Philistine figure.

While the name Maacah contains pagan elements, one finds in 2 Chr 13 that the name Micayahu, which means 'Who is like YHWH', has the divine element 'YA' within the name. This phenomenon is similar to the Chronicler's use of Abijah for Abijam as we have already considered. Furthermore, the modifying phrase of Abijah in 2 Chr 13:2, 'a daughter of Uriel of Gibeah' has divine and Israelite elements.<sup>268</sup> The name אֲרִיאֵל ('Uriel') means 'My light is God', and Gibeah is a town of Benjamin, an Israelite tribe (1 Sam 13:2; 14:16). In particular, the Israelite character of Gibeah is clearly seen in a dialogue between a Levite and his servant in Judg 19:11-12:

When they were near Jebus, the day was far spent, and the servant said to his master, 'Come now, let us turn aside to this city of the Jebusites, and spend the night in it'. But his master said to him, 'We will not turn aside into a city of foreigners, who do not belong to the people of Israel; but we will continue on to Gibeah'.

In the Levite's reply to his servant, Gibeah's Israelite character is underscored in contrast to the foreign town, Jebus.

In 1 Kgs 15:2, it is written that Abijah's mother is Maacah, daughter of Abishalom. It is generally agreed that אֲבִישָׁלוֹם in 1 Kgs 15:2 is a variant of אֲבִשָׁלוֹם (2 Chr 11:20)<sup>269</sup>. Just as the Chronicler was uncomfortable with a pagan name for Abijah's mother, he was also uncomfortable in making an ancestral connection with Absalom, David's rebellious son who made a conspiracy against the

---

<sup>268</sup> Johnstone, *1 & 2 Chronicles* II, 51.

<sup>269</sup> "אֲבִישָׁלוֹם," HALOT I, 6.

Davidic kingdom, when Abijah proclaims the legitimacy of the Davidic kingship against Jeroboam and the northern Israelites.

Then how do we explain the relationship of the two different modifiers, ‘daughter of Abishalom’ and ‘daughter of Uriel of Gibeah’ respectively in 1 Kgs 15:2 and 2 Chr 13:2? According to Dillard’s reconstruction, Maacah can be a daughter of both Absalom and Uriel.<sup>270</sup> Reading from 2 Sam 14:27, in which Absalom has three sons and one daughter named Tamar, and 2 Sam 18:18, which indicates the death of his three sons in their youth, Dillard presumes that Maacah is, in fact, a granddaughter of Absalom.<sup>271</sup> In Dillard’s presumption, Absalom’s only daughter Tamar was married to Uriel of Gibeah and gave birth to Maacah. Though Dillard’s reconstruction is plausible, it remains unproven.

There is another difficulty that remains surrounding the name of Abijah’s mother. In 2 Chr 15:16a, Maacah appears as the mother of Asa, who is son of Abijah:

Also Maacah, mother of Asa, the king removed her from being queen because she made an abominable thing for Asherah. (my translation)

Accordingly in Chronicles, Maacah is the mother of Asa, son of Abijah (2 Chr 15:16), as well as the mother of Abijah (2 Chr 13:2). John Bright leaves room for brotherhood between Abijah and Asa<sup>272</sup>, yet this is unlikely, simply because the relationship between Abijah and Asa is defined as father and son in 2 Chr 13:23:

So Abijah slept with his ancestors, and they buried him in the city of David. *His son Asa* succeeded him. In his days the land had rest for ten years.

---

<sup>270</sup> Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 99.

<sup>271</sup> Ibid. 2 Sam 14:27 - ‘There were born to Absalom three sons, and one daughter whose name was Tamar; she was a beautiful woman’. 2 Sam 18:18 - ‘Now Absalom in his lifetime had taken and set up for himself a pillar that is in the King’s Valley, for he said, “I have no son to keep my name in remembrance”; he called the pillar by his own name. It is called Absalom’s Monument to this day’.

<sup>272</sup> John Bright, *A History of Israel* (London: SCM Press, 1960), 220.

It is most plausible, however, to view Maacah as a queen mother, who is in fact the grandmother of Asa. When Asa was enthroned after Abijah's short three-year reign, Maacah, grandmother of Asa, could have a great influence upon Asa. 1 Kgs 15:9-10 confirms that Maacah, מַאכָּה בִּתּוּלָה in 2 Chr 15:16 is the mother of Abijah and daughter of Abishalom (1 Kgs 15:1-2):

Now in the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam son of Nebat, Abijam began to reign over Judah. He reigned for three years in Jerusalem. *His mother's name was Maacah daughter of Abishalom.* (1 Kgs 15:1-2)

In the twentieth year of King Jeroboam of Israel, Asa began to reign over Judah; he reigned forty-one years in Jerusalem. *His mother's name was Maacah daughter of Abishalom.* (1 Kgs 15:9-10)<sup>273</sup>

Thus, although it is difficult to provide a complete answer to the issues surrounding Abijah's mother's name, it can be suggested that the Chronicler intends to portray Abijah's mother favourably. This is accomplished by first choosing 'Micayahu' for 'Maacah' and second, 'daughter of Uriel of Gibeah' for 'daughter of Abishalom'. In 2 Chr 11:20, where the Chronicler outlines Rehoboam's family, the name of Abijah's mother is 'Maacah', but Abijah's mother's name, its modifier, and Abijah's name are presented in a favorable way directly before Abijah's speech.<sup>274</sup>

These favorable wordings toward Abijah function to enhance the validity of Abijah's speech. To convey his ideology affirmatively and convincingly, the Chronicler meticulously chooses the names of the speaker and even his ancestors, which carry orthodoxy and divine components. The Chronicler fully realizes that the speech of an ungodly king would not impact the reader positively no matter how good the content may be. This encouraging introduction of Abijah would prepare readers to affirm the message coming from the mouth of this king.

### 2. 3. 1 Kgs 15:3-5//omission in 2 Chronicles 13

<sup>273</sup> Cf., Ἀνα θυγάτηρ Ἀβεσσαλωμ (3 Kgdms 15:10, LXX)

<sup>274</sup> 2 Chr 11:20-21a: 'After her he (Rehoboam) took Maacah daughter of Absalom, who bore him Abijah, Attai, Ziza, and Shelomith. Rehoboam loved Maacah daughter of Absalom more than all his other wives and concubines'.

With very little difference, the introduction of Abijah in 2 Chr 13:1-2 corresponds to the Deuteronomist's introduction in 1 Kgs 15:1-2. Following this introduction, however, the synoptic text of 1 Kgs 15:3-5 is conspicuously absent in Chronicles:

He committed all the sins that his father did before him; his heart was not true to the LORD his God, like the heart of his father David.  
<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless for David's sake the LORD his God gave him a lamp in Jerusalem, setting up his son after him, and establishing Jerusalem; <sup>5</sup> because David did what was right in the sight of the LORD, and did not turn aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite. (1 Kgs 15:3-5)

Without the text of 1 Kgs 15:3-5, the Chronicler immediately enters the war narrative between Abijah and Jeroboam, which is absent from the Deuteronomistic history.

Why does the Chronicler appear to fail to include the text of 1 Kgs 15:3-5?

1 Kgs 15:3-5 can be divided into two parts: v. 3 and vv. 4-5. In v. 3 the Deuteronomist makes a negative evaluation of Abijah, who committed all the sins of his father, and in vv. 4-5 he highlights God's blessing upon David's house for David's sake. In Chronicles, the lack of this negative evaluation of Abijah in v. 3 is deliberate. Since the negative assessment damages the image of Abijah, the defender of the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty, the Chronicler excludes it.

However it is intriguing that the Chronicler makes no mention of the tradition found in vv.4-5, which speaks about God's promised continuity of the Davidic kingdom based on the righteousness of King David. The ideology of the Davidic covenant in 1 Kgs 15:4-5 is not only acceptable but also desirable for the Chronicler who emphasizes the legitimacy of the eternal Davidic kingdom in the subsequent speech of Abijah. Nevertheless, there is good reason for the meticulous Chronicler to make no mention of the tradition found in 1 Kgs 15:4-5. It is difficult to think of the absence of vv. 4-5 separately from the absence of v. 3. Verses 4-5, beginning with a concessive **וְ**, responds to v. 3 by saying that 'in spite of' Abijah's sins, God sustains Judah for his loyal servant David. In the light of the structure, 1 Kgs 15:4-5 responds to 1 Kgs 15:3 and the absence of v. 3 leaves no place for vv. 4-5.



### 3. Further Issues

Without the synoptic text of Kgs 15:3-5, the Chronicler directly introduces the war narrative between Abijah and Jeroboam in 2 Chr 13:2b that lasts through to v. 21. Since this war narrative, which includes Abijah's speech, is not present in the Deuteronomistic history, it may reveal more clearly the Chronicler's own ideology. Abijah's proclamation of the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty is key to understanding the Chronicler's view on the Davidic covenant. Having examined this war narrative, I conclude that the Chronicler expresses his hope for the reinstallation of the lost kingdom of David. The following arguments demonstrate the Chronicler's support for the revival of the Davidic dynasty.

#### 3. 1. Arguments for the revival of the Davidic dynasty

##### 3. 1. 1. The Davidic kingdom as YHWH's kingdom

As we have seen already in 1 Chr 17:14, the Chronicler's equation of the kingdom of David with the kingdom of God reveals the importance he attaches to the Davidic kingdom and the Davidic covenant.<sup>275</sup> Verse 8 clearly shows this equation:

And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD  
in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and  
have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you.  
(2 Chr 13:8)

Placed in the mouth of Abijah, the Chronicler declares that Judah is the kingdom of YHWH, who gave it into the hands of the sons of David. Abijah warns Jeroboam and the northern Israelites that however great they are, they cannot withstand the kingdom of Judah, which is in fact the kingdom of the almighty God, YHWH. In v. 12, the Israelites' battle against Judah is seen as a battle against YHWH:

See, God is with us at our head, and his priests have their battle  
trumpets to sound the call to battle against you. O Israelites, do not

---

<sup>275</sup> See pp. 62-65 of this work.

fight against the LORD, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed. (2 Chr 13:12)

Abijah unequivocally declares that Israelites cannot succeed in the battle against God's kingdom and the result of the battle appears to justify his speech:

Then the people of Judah raised the battle shout. And when the people of Judah shouted, God defeated Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah. The Israelites fled before Judah, and God gave them into their hands. (2 Chr 13:15-16)

In a war narrative, a proclamation is justified by the result of the war. In the battle narrative of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, and Hezekiah, king of Judah, Sennacherib's official makes a promulgation against Hezekiah and Judah:

Do you not know what I and my ancestors have done to all the peoples of other lands? Were the gods of the nations of those lands at all able to save their lands out of my hand? Who among all the gods of those nations that my ancestors utterly destroyed was able to save his people from my hand, that your God should be able to save you from my hand? Now therefore do not let Hezekiah deceive you or mislead you in this fashion, and do not believe him, for no god of any nation or kingdom has been able to save his people from my hand or from the hand of my ancestors. How much less will your God save you out of my hand! (2 Chr 32:13-15)

However, this proclamation turns out to be empty when the outcome of the battle fails to favour Sennacherib:

And the LORD sent an angel who cut off all the mighty warriors and commanders and officers in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned in disgrace to his own land. When he came into the house of his god, some of his own sons struck him down there with the sword. (2 Chr 32:21)

Unlike the empty promulgation of Sennacherib, the Chronicler justifies Abijah's speech against Jeroboam and the northern Israelites through the result of the battle. In other words, the fulfillment of Abijah's proclamation enhances the validity of Abijah speech as a whole. Consequently, Abijah's words reflect the beliefs and

ideologies of the Chronicler.<sup>276</sup> In this way, the Chronicler expresses his strong desire for the revival of the Davidic kingdom based on the eternal covenant.

### 3. 1. 2. Two foci of Abijah's speech

Abijah's speech reflects two foci of the Chronicler's ideology: the legitimacy of the eternity of the Davidic dynasty (vv. 4b-8a) and the legitimacy of sacrifice in the Jerusalem Temple (vv. 8b-12).

The legitimacy of the eternity of the Davidic dynasty (4b-8a):

Listen to me, Jeroboam and all Israel! Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? Yet Jeroboam son of Nebat, a servant of Solomon son of David, rose up and rebelled against his lord; and certain worthless scoundrels gathered around him and defied Rehoboam son of Solomon, when Rehoboam was young and irresolute and could not withstand them. And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David,

The legitimacy of sacrifice in Jerusalem Temple (vv 8b-12):

Because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. Have you not driven out the priests of the LORD, the descendants of Aaron, and the Levites, and made priests for yourselves like the peoples of other lands? Whoever comes to be consecrated with a young bull or seven rams becomes a priest of what are no gods.<sup>10</sup> But as for us, the LORD is our God, and we have not abandoned him. We have priests ministering to the LORD who are descendants of Aaron, and Levites for their service.<sup>11</sup> They offer to the LORD every morning and every evening burnt offerings and fragrant incense, set out the rows of bread on the table of pure gold, and care for the golden lampstand so that its lamps may burn every evening; for we keep the charge of the LORD our God, but you have abandoned him.<sup>12</sup> See, God is with us at our head, and his priests have their battle trumpets to sound the call to battle against you. O Israelites, do not fight against the LORD, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed.

---

<sup>276</sup> See G. von Rad's "The Levitical Sermon in 1 and II Chronicles," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966), 275-277. In this essay, von Rad attempts to demonstrate that the Chronicler, a Levitical writer, puts his ideology in kings' speeches, which is a Levitical sermon.

The scrupulous Chronicler cogently connects these two foci in v. 8, where he moves from the issue of the Davidic dynasty to proper sacrifice:

וַעֲתָה אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים לְהִתְחַזֵּק לִפְנֵי מַמְלַכַת יְהוָה בְּיַד  
בְּנֵי דָוִיד  
וְאַתֶּם הַמְּוִן רַב וְעַמְּכֶם עֲגֹלֵי זָהָב אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לָכֶם יִרְבָּעָם  
לֵאלֹהִים

And now you think to withstand against the kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of David.

And you are great multitude and with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made for you as gods. (my translation)

The Chronicler accuses the northern Israelites using the same pronoun, **אַתֶּם** ('You') twice: the first **אַתֶּם** is accused of violating the covenant made with the Davidic house and the second **אַתֶּם** worshiped false gods. For the Chronicler, the Davidic dynasty as well as the Jerusalem Temple loom large. If the Chronicler desired to replace the Davidic dynasty with the Temple and its cultus in the postexilic age, he would have highlighted only one focus – legitimate worship – rather than the two concerns he mentioned. Doubtless, it would be possible for the Chronicler to accuse the northern Israelites only of their improper worship, but he does not. Rather, he sets the Davidic covenant first in Abijah's speech, followed by the issue of proper worship in Jerusalem.

The Chronicler's hope for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty is seen from the fact that Abijah's speech does not appear in the Deuteronomistic history but only in Chronicles. The Chronicler willingly includes Abijah's speech, which is absent from Kings. The insertion of Abijah's speech in Chronicles reinforces the view that the Chronicler did hope for the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty based on the eternally binding Davidic covenant.

In the light of these two foci, it is problematic to say, as scholars have done, that the Chronicler was promoting the replacement of the Davidic dynasty with the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus in the postexilic setting. Knoppers is surely correct when he points out the significance of the Davidic covenant for the Chronicler:

Those commentators who affirm the programmatic importance of Abijah's emphasis on cultic orthopraxis, but downplay or even ignore the emphasis on the Davidic rule misconstrue the Chronicler's ideology. Neither Davidic rule nor temple cultus is complete without the other. On the contrary, Abijah's speech remarkably underscores their ongoing relevance for all Israelites.<sup>277</sup>

### 3. 1. 3. The holy war motif

The Chronicler's narration of the battle between Abijah and Jeroboam takes the form of a so-called 'holy war'. At the outset let us note briefly the key characteristics of the holy war motif as presented by G. H. Jones:

Holy war began with the sounding of a trumpet as a sign for the troops to assemble (Judg 6:34f); another particularly solemn method for summoning troops was to send pieces of animal flesh among the people in the hands of messengers (1 Sam 11:7). These assembled forces formed the 'militia of Yahweh' (Judg 5:11) and were duly consecrated (Josh 3:5). Before setting out to battle, sacrifices were offered and an oracle from Yahweh was sought (Judg 20:23, 26). God's favorable reply was usually pronounced in the perfect tense: 'Yahweh has given the enemy into your hand' (Josh 2:24); the declaration of victory with such certainty was an important factor in Holy War. Then Yahweh went out before them to battle (Judg 4:14). This kind of war was Yahweh's war, the enemies were Yahweh's enemies (Judg 5:31). And the campaign was completely in his hands. It was Yahweh too who caused panic to seize the enemies, for his fear fell upon them (Josh 2:8), so that they became faint-hearted (Josh 2:24). The battle itself opened with a loud battle-cry (Judg 7:20), and all through the fighting God was active creating panic and terror among the enemies (Josh 10:10; Judg 4:15). The war was brought to a conclusion with the ban (*herem*); men and animals were put to death, but silver, gold and other possessions were declared 'sacred' to Yahweh (Josh 6:18-19). After this the army disbanded and the men returned to their tents (Judg 20:8). All these formal elements are not preserved together in any single account of a battle, but they become clear in a synopsis of various campaigns.<sup>278</sup>

Overall, 2 Chronicles 13 conforms to these elements of holy war: the blowing of the trumpet is predicted in v. 12 ('See, God is with us at our head, and his priests

---

<sup>277</sup> Gary Knoppers, "Battling Against Yahweh (2 CHR 13:2-20)," *RB* 100 (1993), 515.

<sup>278</sup> G. H. Jones, "The Concept of Holy War," *The World of Ancient Israel*. ed. R. E. Clements (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 302-303.

have their battle trumpets to sound the call to battle against you...') and takes place in v. 14 ('When Judah turned, the battle was in front of them and behind them. They cried out to the LORD, and the priests blew the trumpets'); the battle opens with Judah's battle cry in v. 15 ('Then the people of Judah raised the battle shout. And when the people of Judah shouted...') and God routs the Israelites in v. 15 ('...God defeated Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah'); with God's intervention, Jeroboam and the Israelites flee in panic and terror, and God gave them into the hands of Judah (וַיִּתְּנֵם אֱלֹהִים בְּיָדָם) in v. 16 ('The Israelites fled before Judah, and God gave them into their hands').

In addition, the ambush (v. 13, 'Jeroboam had sent an ambush around to come on them from behind; thus his troops were in front of Judah, and the ambush was behind them'), pre-battle speech (Abijah's speech in vv 4b-12), the offer of peace (v. 12, '...O Israelites, do not fight against the LORD, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed'), cultic purity (The second part of Abijah's speech in vv 8b-12), and a large number of armies (v. 3, 'Abijah engaged in battle, having an army of valiant warriors, four hundred thousand picked men; and Jeroboam drew up his line of battle against him with eight hundred thousand picked mighty warriors') are holy war motifs.<sup>279</sup>

In general, a holy war refers to a war in which YHWH fights as warrior.<sup>280</sup> In the battle between Abijah, with the Judean army, and Jeroboam, with the Israelite army, God fights on Abijah's side against Jeroboam, and the battle ends with Judah's victory. As Abijah speaks in v. 12, the Israelites' fight against Judah is precisely a fight against YHWH. Though there are battles between Judah and Israel in the book of Kings, the Deuteronomist never portrays the battles in the form of a holy war.<sup>281</sup> The Deuteronomist would not portray God as a fighter against any Israelites, whether they are southerners or northerners. For the Deuteronomist, Israel is God's people and therefore God would not fight against his own people.

<sup>279</sup> Thompson, *1,2 Chronicles*, 263; Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 105.

<sup>280</sup> Jones, "The Concept of Holy War," 299.

<sup>281</sup> Knoppers, "Battling Against Yahweh (2 CHR 13:2-20)," 515

What makes the Chronicler so bold as to depict God as a fighter in a holy war against his people in northern Israel? The reason is found in Abijah's pre-battle speech with the double foci, as we have already analyzed. The northern Israelites' rebellion against the Davidic dynasty and their idolatry deserve God's judgment directed against them in the form of a holy war. Consequently, the result of the war justifies Abijah's advocacy of the eternal kingship of the Davidic house over Judah and Israel.

In opposition to the holy war motif in 2 Chronicles 13, Japhet contends that divine intervention in a war is a common phenomenon throughout the Old Testament and the battle of Abijah is but one of the wars where such divine intervention is present.<sup>282</sup> Since a standard of the holy war genre does not exist, it is sometimes difficult to judge whether a battle narrative is or is not a so-called holy war narrative. However, in the case of 2 Chronicles 13, and even if the holy war motif is denied, divine intervention on behalf of Abijah is clearly present and it enhances the validity of Abijah's speech and the perpetuity of the Davidic covenant within the speech.

### 3. 1. 4. The positive portrayal of Abijah

The significance of the Davidic covenant in his speech is heightened when Abijah is portrayed in a positive manner. In addition to the positive light cast upon Abijah by favorable presentation of his name and the names of his ancestors, the Chronicler portrays Abijah more positively by means of an antithesis between Abijah and Jeroboam.<sup>283</sup> The Chronicler's negative description of Jeroboam and the Israelites plays a part in stressing the positive image of Abijah.

This antithesis is found in various places in 2 Chronicles 13. In v. 6, for example, Jeroboam is modified by the phrase, 'son of Nebat', which is absent in previous verses (vv. 1, 2, 3, 4). This modifier highlights that Jeroboam is not a descendant of David, but a 'son of Nebat'.<sup>284</sup> The Chronicler also includes the

---

<sup>282</sup> Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 783.

<sup>283</sup> Isaac Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*, 344.

<sup>284</sup> Johnstone, *I & 2 Chronicles II*, 54.

identification of Jeroboam by another modifying phrase, ‘servant of Solomon, son of David’, which stresses that Jeroboam is not a son of Solomon but simply Solomon’s servant. Another antithesis occurs in the ‘you’ of v. 8 and the ‘we’ of v. 10:

And now you (אַתָּם) think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you (וְאַתָּם) are a great multitude and have with you (וְעִמָּכֶם) the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you (לָכֶם) ...<sup>10</sup> But as for us (וְאַנְחֵנוּ), the LORD is our God (אֱלֹהֵינוּ), and we (עַזְבֵּנָהוּ) have not abandoned him. We have priests ministering to the LORD who are descendants of Aaron, and Levites for their service.

Thus, the Chronicler is making clear that the golden calves, which Jeroboam made, are gods for ‘You’, then YHWH is ‘our’ God (אֱלֹהֵינוּ).

There are, however, two issues that possibly harm the positive image of Abijah in 2 Chronicles 13. First, Abijah’s three-year reign could be interpreted as a bad sign. Generally, in the history of Judah and Israel, good kings live a long life and bad kings’ reigns are short. However, that is not strictly followed. As Japhet says, wicked king Manasseh’s long fifty-five year reign (2 Chr 33:1) and good king Josiah’s untimely death (2 Chr 35:23-24) are examples of the exception to the longevity criterion.<sup>285</sup> Thus, the short reign of Abijah is not necessarily a negative judgment against him.

The second issue of possible harm upon Abijah’s portrait concerns the initiation of the battle between Abijah and Jeroboam. According to 2 Chr 11:4, it is not desirable to initiate a battle against a brother country:

Thus says the LORD: You shall not go up or fight against your kindred. Let everyone return home, for this thing is from me...

In 2 Chr 11:4, Shemaiah, a man of God, tells Rehoboam and Judah not to go up and fight against Israel. In 2 Chr 13:3, however, we read:

---

<sup>285</sup> Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, 688.



וַיִּאָסֶר אֲבִיָּה אֶת־הַמִּלְחָמָה בְּחֵיל גְּבוּרֵי מִלְחָמָה  
 אַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף אִישׁ בַּחֹר ס וַיִּרְבְּעֵם עָרֶךְ עִמּוֹ מִלְחָמָה  
 בְּשִׁמוּנָה מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף אִישׁ בַּחֹר גְּבוּרֵי חֵיל

Abijah engaged in battle, having an army of valiant warriors, four hundred thousand picked men; and Jeroboam drew up his line of battle against him with eight hundred thousand picked mighty warriors.

Specifically, the issue here is whether וַיִּאָסֶר אֲבִיָּה אֶת־הַמִּלְחָמָה of 2 Chr 13:3 implies Abijah's initiation of the battle. NASB renders it as 'Abijah began the battle', and McKenzie agrees with the translation of NASB.<sup>286</sup> Does the Chronicler portray Abijah as the aggressor of the battle?

The basic meaning of אָסַר is 'to bind',<sup>287</sup> and accordingly NRSV translates the clause as 'Abijah engaged in battle'. De Vries translates אָסַר as 'took on', and maintains that Abijah's taking on the battle is in response to Jeroboam's attack.<sup>288</sup> If we translate אָסַר based on its root meaning, 'to bind', a sensible translation of it would be 'to engage' in this context, and Abijah's engagement of the battle does not render him necessarily as an aggressor.

### 3. 1. 5. שְׁמָעוּנִי as the Chronicler's catchword for his ideology

Abijah's speech in 2 Chr 13:4-12, which begins with שְׁמָעוּנִי ('Hear me'), reflects what the Chronicler himself wants to say. According to McKenzie, 'The speech is merely a forum for the Chronicler to express his own theology'.<sup>289</sup> This assertion is confirmed when we examine the other five speeches that begin with שְׁמָעוּנִי in Chronicles: 1 Chr 28:2; 2 Chr 15:2; 20:20; 28:11; 29:5.

Among the five speeches, three speeches are given by the kings whom the Chronicler approves as good kings and two speeches are made by God's prophets.

<sup>286</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 270-271.

<sup>287</sup> HALOT I, 45.

<sup>288</sup> De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 291.

<sup>289</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 271.

1 Chr 28:2 – King David’s speech:

Then King David rose to his feet and said: ‘*Hear me (שְׁמַעֲנִי)*, my brothers and my people. I had planned to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD, for the footstool of our God; and I made preparations for building’.

2 Chr 15:1-2 – Prophet Azariah’s speech:

The spirit of God came upon Azariah son of Oded. He went out to meet Asa and said to him, ‘*Hear me (שְׁמַעֲנִי)*, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin: The LORD is with you, while you are with him. If you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you abandon him, he will abandon you’.

2 Chr 20:20 – King Jehoshaphat’s speech:

They rose early in the morning and went out into the wilderness of Tekoa; and as they went out, Jehoshaphat stood and said, ‘*Listen to me (שְׁמַעֲנִי)*, O Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem! Believe in the LORD your God and you will be established; believe his prophets’.

2 Chr 28:9-11 – Prophet Oded’s speech:

But a prophet of the LORD was there, whose name was Oded; he went out to meet the army that came to Samaria, and said to them, ‘Because the LORD, the God of your ancestors, was angry with Judah, he gave them into your hand, but you have killed them in a rage that has reached up to heaven. Now you intend to subjugate the people of Judah and Jerusalem, male and female, as your slaves. But what have you except sins against the LORD your God? Now *hear me (שְׁמַעֲנִי)*, and send back the captives whom you have taken from your kindred, for the fierce wrath of the LORD is upon you’.

2 Chr 29:5 – King Hezekiah’s speech:

He said to them, ‘*Listen to me (שְׁמַעֲנִי)*, Levites! Sanctify yourselves, and sanctify the house of the LORD, the God of your ancestors, and carry out the filth from the holy place’.

1 Chr 28:2 is part of David’s public address concerning the future construction of the Temple by Solomon. God’s prophecy through Azariah in 2 Chr 15:2-7 facilitates Asa’s reform of corrupt Judah. The Jehoshaphat speech of 2 Chr 20:2 encourages Judah and the people of Jerusalem to keep faith in the Lord when they encounter the enemies, Ammon and Moab. 2 Chr 28:9-11 includes Oded’s prophecy for northern Israel to release their kinsmen, Judah. In 2 Chr 29:5-11, Hezekiah charges the Levites to consecrate the Temple and the Temple personnel.

Examination of all the speeches beginning with שְׁמַעוּנִי in Chronicles shows that the Chronicler uses the catchword שְׁמַעוּנִי to express his theology through the mouths of God's approved agents. Thus, Abijah's speech with שְׁמַעוּנִי in 2 Chr 13:4-12 reveals the Chronicler's belief that the Davidic covenant is eternally binding.

### 3. 1. 6. בְּרִית מֶלֶח

The Chronicler's hope for the revival of the Davidic dynasty is encapsulated in the phrase בְּרִית מֶלֶח ('covenant of salt') in Abijah's speech in 2 Chr 13:5.

Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by *a covenant of salt* (בְּרִית מֶלֶח)?

As von Rad claims, בְּרִית מֶלֶח (*Salzbund*) indicates the permanence of the Davidic covenant.<sup>290</sup> Although we do not exactly know the original context of the phrase בְּרִית מֶלֶח, its occurrence in another biblical text helps us understand that the eternal nature of the covenant is in view.<sup>291</sup> The other occurrence of בְּרִית מֶלֶח in Num 18:19 confirms the meaning of the phrase:

כָּל תְּרוֹמַת הַקֹּדְשִׁים אֲשֶׁר יָרִימוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לַיהוָה נְתַתִּי  
לָךְ וּלְבָנֶיךָ וּלְבָנֹתֶיךָ אֶתְךָ לְחֶק־עוֹלָם בְּרִית מֶלֶח עוֹלָם  
הוּא לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לָךְ וּלְזֶרְעֶךָ אֶתְךָ

All the holy offerings that the Israelites present to the LORD I have given to you, together with your sons and daughters, as a perpetual due; it is *a covenant of salt* forever before the LORD for you and your descendants as well.

The phrase 'covenant of salt' is used when the Lord speaks to Aaron about the permanent sacrifice due to him and his sons. The permanent character of the בְּרִית מֶלֶח is stressed by two עוֹלָם immediately before and after the phrase. Like Num 18:19, לְעוֹלָם in 2 Chr 13:5 occurs before the recipients (לְךָ וּלְבָנֶיךָ) of the kingship of the covenant of salt:

<sup>290</sup> Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 125.

<sup>291</sup> Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 252.

הֲלֹא לָכֶם לָדַעַת כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נָתַן מִמְלָכָה  
לְדָוִיד עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעוֹלָם לוֹ וּלְבָנָיו בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ

Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel *forever* to David and his sons by a covenant of salt?

According to H. C. Trumbull, the phrase ‘covenant of salt’ in the Old Testament implies permanency and unchangeableness.<sup>292</sup> Just as God gives the holy offerings of Israel to Aaron and his sons as a perpetual covenant of salt, so God gives the kingship to David and his sons as an eternal covenant.

William Riley opposes the view that בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ in 2 Chr 13:5 indicates the Chronicler’s interest in the revival of the Davidic dynasty.<sup>293</sup> Riley insists that the focus of Abijah’s speech is Judah’s loyalty to the legitimate cultus rather than his position as a descendant of David.<sup>294</sup> He emphasizes the cultic function of Davidic kings based on the use of בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ in Num 18:19:

It is possible to construe the significance of the phrase בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ in Num 18:19 somewhat differently, taking the primary significance to be rooted in the bond that arises from a common meal and not in a notion of permanency... The bond ultimately depends on the liturgical role which the priests have been called upon to exercise in Israel, and the perpetuity of the bond is linked to the perpetuity of their function. The Chronicler may have similar significance in mind for his use of בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ in 2 Chr 13:5, even though there is no explicit reference to a common meal. Yahweh has truly given the kingship to David and his house; their functioning in this role brings about the perpetuation of a bond which can be described as בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ; as in the case of the Aaronide priests in Num 18:19, the bond arises from a function of cultic dimension, and the Chronicler may be using the expression to emphasize this aspect of the bond.<sup>295</sup>

<sup>292</sup> H. C. Trumbull, *The Covenant of Salt* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1899), 19.

<sup>293</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 117-118.

<sup>294</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>295</sup> *Ibid.*, 117-118.

Riley's link between Aaronide priests' perpetual sacrificial offerings and the perpetual cultic function of Aaronide priests does seem plausible. Here, two elements – sacrificial portions for the Aaronide priests and the Aaronide's priestly function – are inseparably connected. In other words, it is impossible to assume perpetual sacrificial offerings for the Aaronide priests without their perpetual priestly function. However, Riley's link of the cultic function to the **ברית מלח** of 2 Chr 13:5 is problematic because the phrase **ברית מלח** in 2 Chr 13:5 is clearly the 'covenant of salt' of the Davidic covenant as the **כִּי** clause discloses:

כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נָתַן מִמְלָכָה לְדָוִיד עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל  
לְעוֹלָם לֹו וּלְבָנָיו

That the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to  
David and his sons

We have already seen that, from the structural point of view, Abijah's speech has two foci: the legitimacy of the eternal Davidic dynasty in vv. 4b-8a and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem cult in vv. 8b-12. In this clearly divided structure, **ברית מלח** belongs to the first part where the eternity of the Davidic covenant is proclaimed.

Pomykala also questions that the phrase, 'covenant of salt', signals the Chronicler's hope for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty:

If the message of the passage for the Chronicler's audience was in fact that 'the Lord God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt', by the late Persian period, God would have violated his own 'covenant of salt' for between 150 to 225 years, since the sons of David did not possess the kingship during this time. Far from inspiring hope in the Lord's re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty, it would stand as an illustration of the Lord's failure to make good on his word. Abijah's statement makes no allowance for a hiatus in the continuity of Davidic kingship.<sup>296</sup>

Pomykala is correct to read the text in the context of the postexilic period when the Davidic kingship no longer existed. However, it is too bold to claim that the Chronicler expresses the Lord's failure to make good on the Davidic covenant as a

<sup>296</sup> Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynastic Tradition in Early Judaism*, 100.

covenant of salt. The text does not provide any evidence that the covenant of salt given to David and his descendants turns out to be wrong. Contrary to Pomykala's assertion, the Chronicler expresses his hope for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty when it did not exist. The Chronicler's robust belief in the revival of the Davidic dynasty leads him to insert Abijah's speech, and the key phrase **בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ** within it, which is not included in the Deuteronomic history.

Pomykala maintains that the cessation of the Davidic kingship from the destruction of Judah to the time of the Chronicler is a violation to the covenant of salt. However, as we have already observed, an important concept of the 'covenant of salt' is permanence. If we consider God as the giver of the covenant of salt and permanence as its key concept, it is scarcely likely that the Chronicler intends to speak of a violation of the sacred covenant of salt. What the Chronicler points to is not the violation of the covenant, but the revival of the Davidic dynasty founded on this covenant. In fact, contrary to Pomykala's contention, the hiatus in the Davidic kingship is accepted and is not believed to indicate a failure of the covenant of salt. For the Chronicler, the temporary cessation of the Davidic kingship is insufficient to deny the validity of the Davidic covenant. Rather, the Davidic covenant makes possible the temporary cessation (hiatus) and revival of the Davidic kingship.

### 3. 2. Arguments against the revival of the Davidic dynasty

Some scholars insist that the Chronicler does not believe in the revival of the Davidic dynasty in 2 Chronicles 13.

#### 3. 2. 1. Caquot

Caquot claims that 2 Chr 13:5 ('Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt?') are words taken from the mouth of Solomon's successor, rather than those of the Chronicler.<sup>297</sup> While it is possible to separate what the narrator says from that of one of the characters in his narrative, I believe that there are three reasons why this is

---

<sup>297</sup> Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," 119.

not the case here. First, in 2 Chronicles 13, Abijah's speech is supported by YHWH. Abijah proclaims, 'YHWH is our God' (v. 10) and God destroys Jeroboam and his army. God's support for Abijah is an indicator of the Chronicler's support for Abijah. Secondly, as we have observed through the Chronicler's use of **שְׁמִיעֲנִי**, the Chronicler uses the character of King Abijah to express his own ideology.<sup>298</sup> Third, if Abijah's speech is unrelated to the Chronicler's own beliefs, then why does the Chronicler include Abijah's speech and the battle against Jeroboam, which are not in the Deuteronomistic history? It is difficult to escape the conclusion that he includes these in order to express his own ideology.

### 3. 2. 2. Pomykala

In opposition to the royalist interpretation of Abijah's speech, Pomykala holds that 2 Chr 13:5 is not used to express hope in the renewal of the monarchy, but rather functions in order to condemn Jeroboam's usurpation of the kingship of Israel.<sup>299</sup> The difficulty in Pomykala's argument lies in the inseparability of the condemnation of Jeroboam's usurpation of the kingship of Israel and the permanent dynastic promise granted to David as the covenant of salt. In 2 Chr 13:5, Jeroboam is condemned for usurpation because he ignores the covenant of salt, that is, the Davidic covenant.

Pomykala also argues that between Abijah's foci of rebellion against the Davidic kings and the abandonment of proper worship in Jerusalem, only the second point carries a meaningful counterpoint in the Chronicler's time.<sup>300</sup> However, the main force of the covenant of salt is perpetuity, as we have seen. Just as the Chronicler expresses concern over legitimate worship matters in his cultic society, so too the eternity of the Davidic dynastic covenant matters for the Chronicler, who lives without Davidic kingship. Pomykala says that the Davidic covenant is irrelevant when Davidic kingship did not exist. On the contrary, the eternal Davidic kingship, which is

---

<sup>298</sup> See pp. 168-170 of this work.

<sup>299</sup> Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynastic Tradition in Early Judaism*, 100.

<sup>300</sup> *Ibid.*, 100-101.

the covenant of salt, matters more for the Chronicler now that the Davidic kingship has ceased.

### 3. 2. 3. Riley

Riley cites 2 Chronicles 13 as a reinterpretation of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles at a time when there were no Davidic kings.<sup>301</sup> According to Riley, the reinterpretation of the promise is prompted largely by cultic commemoration.<sup>302</sup> Riley believes that the Davidic dynasty carries out the important role of establishing the Temple and its cultus, and the Davidic covenant persists in the Israelites' faithfulness to the worship at the Temple and to its cultus.<sup>303</sup> Riley uses 2 Chr 13:10-12 to show YHWH's presence with his people who are moreover faithful to the cultus, and 2 Chr 13:13-18 to demonstrate divine victory accompanied by cultic actions:<sup>304</sup>

But as for us, the LORD is our God, and we have not abandoned him. We have priests ministering to the LORD who are descendants of Aaron, and Levites for their service. They offer to the LORD every morning and every evening burnt offerings and fragrant incense, set out the rows of bread on the table of pure gold, and care for the golden lampstand so that its lamps may burn every evening; for we keep the charge of the LORD our God, but you have abandoned him. See, God is with us at our head, and his priests have their battle trumpets to sound the call to battle against you. O Israelites, do not fight against the LORD, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed. (2 Chr 13:10-12)

Jeroboam had sent an ambush around to come on them from behind; thus his troops were in front of Judah, and the ambush was behind them. When Judah turned, the battle was in front of them and behind them. They cried out to the LORD, and the priests blew the trumpets. Then the people of Judah raised the battle shout. And when the people of Judah shouted, God defeated Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah. The Israelites fled before Judah, and God gave them into their hands. Abijah and his army defeated them with great slaughter; five hundred thousand picked men of Israel fell slain. Thus the

---

<sup>301</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 33, 185.

<sup>302</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>303</sup> *Ibid.*, 180-201.

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*, 33, 185.



Israelites were subdued at that time, and the people of Judah prevailed, because they relied on the LORD, the God of their ancestors. (2 Chr 13:13-18)

As Riley states, 2 Chr 13:10-12 illustrates God's presence in cultic faithfulness, and 2 Chr 13:13-18 holds cultic elements in the divine victory. As we have already seen, the war takes the form of a holy war and the cultic element is a main feature of a holy war narrative. However, Riley does not persuasively explain how these cultic elements can replace the Davidic covenant in the text, particularly in 2 Chr 13:4b-8a:

Listen to me, Jeroboam and all Israel! Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? Yet Jeroboam son of Nebat, a servant of Solomon son of David, rose up and rebelled against his lord; and certain worthless scoundrels gathered around him and defied Rehoboam son of Solomon, when Rehoboam was young and irresolute and could not withstand them. 'And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David the kingdom of the LORD, which is in the hand of the sons of David'.

The important factor for Riley's reinterpretation is the Chronicler's context, that is, the non-existence of the Davidic kingdom. He highlights the role of the Davidic dynasty in the establishment of the Temple and its cultus. He maintains that as far as there is faithfulness in the Temple worship and its cultus, the Davidic dynastic covenant is fulfilled in it. However, the non-existence of the Davidic kingdom could prompt the Chronicler's desire for its revival rather than its replacement by the Temple and its cultus. Particularly, as we investigated the structure of Abijah's speech in 2 Chronicles 13, there are two emphases: the eternity of the Davidic covenant in vv. 4b-8a and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus in vv. 8b-12.<sup>305</sup> Riley needs to acknowledge the significance of the first part of Abijah's speech, the eternity of the Davidic covenant, *along with* the second part of the speech. Furthermore, the text does not give any clue that the Davidic covenant is fulfilled through the Israelites' faithfulness to the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus.

---

<sup>305</sup> See pp. 162-164 of this work.

#### 4. Conclusion

As the above investigation demonstrates, the Chronicler expresses his desire for the revival of the Davidic dynasty in 2 Chronicles 13. The synoptic comparison between 2 Chr 13 and 1 Kgs 15:1-8 reveals the following four results. First, the Chronicler's only synchronism in 2 Chr 13:1 indicates the sharp contrast between Abijah and Jeroboam as the protagonist and antagonist respectively within the narrative. Secondly, unlike the Deuteronomist's Abijam, which carries a pagan element, the Chronicler's Abijah, which denotes a divine element, contributes to the positive image of Abijah. Thirdly, Abijah's mother's name and its modifier in Chronicles, 'Micayahu, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah' (*contra* 'Maacah daughter of Absalom') further establishes a positive portrait of Abijah. If 'Maacah, daughter of Absalom' has pagan elements and denotes rebellion against the Davidic dynasty, then Micayahu and its modifier, 'Uriel of Gibeah' have divine and Israelite implications. Fourth, whereas 1 Kgs 15:3-5 includes a negative evaluation of Abijah, the Chronicler does not have this synoptic text in 2 Chronicles 13. Although 1 Kgs 15:4-5 mentions the Davidic covenant, due to its inseparable relationship to 1 Kgs 15:3, where Abijah is negatively assessed, the Chronicler excludes 1 Kgs 15:3-5 as a set.

2 Chronicles 13 sheds light on the Chronicler's hope for the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty. The six arguments for this are as follows. First, in Abijah's speech, the Chronicler's equation of the kingdom of David with the kingdom of YHWH indicates the significance of the Davidic kingdom for the Chronicler. Secondly, the two foci of Abijah's speech, the eternity of the Davidic dynasty and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus, are of equal import. Thirdly, the battle between Abijah and Jeroboam takes the form of holy war and Abijah's complete victory reinforces the Davidic covenant in Abijah's speech. Fourthly, the Chronicler portrays Abijah positively throughout the chapter. Using the literary device of antithesis, the Chronicler discloses the laudible image of Abijah which heightens the validity and significance of the king's speech. Fifthly, Abijah's speech begins with שְׁמַעְנִי and the other five occurrences of שְׁמַעְנִי in Chronicles occur in the speeches of God's prophets and the approved kings of Judah. The Chronicler intends to express

his ideology of the eternity of the Davidic covenant in Abijah's speech. Finally, a strong piece of evidence for the Chronicler's hope for the revival of the Davidic dynasty is the phrase, בְּרִית מְלָח, which signifies permanency. The hiatus of the Davidic kingdom does not mean the failure of the covenant of salt, but the permanent covenant of salt is the foundation of the Davidic dynasty even in its hiatus.

Against the Chronicler's hope for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty reflected in 2 Chronicles 13, Caquot claims that 2 Chr 13:5 is not the Chronicler's own words but those of Solomon's successor. However, considering God's support for Abijah's speech through the king's victory in battle, the Chronicler's use of שְׁמַעְנִי to express his theology, and his insertion of Abijah's speech as his *Sondergut*, we cannot simply accept that 2 Chr 13:5 is the word of a Davidic king which has no relation to the Chronicler's intention. Pomykala contends that the focus of Abijah's speech is the condemnation of Jeroboam's usurpation rather than the renewal of the Davidic dynasty. However, the condemnation of Jeroboam's usurpation cannot be considered without advocating the Davidic covenant. Riley claims that the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus replaced the Davidic dynasty in the postexilic period so that it is the Israelites' faithfulness to the Jerusalem Temple that fulfills the Davidic covenant. However, he does not explain *how* the Davidic covenant persists in the Israelites' faithfulness to the Temple and its cultus.

## IX. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 21:2-7

### 1. Setting

2 Chr 21:2-7 is the beginning of a larger unit, 2 Chr 21:2-23:21, in which the Davidic line is jeopardized through the reign of Jehoram, Ahaziah and Athaliah. The danger stems from Jehoshaphat's alliance with Israel's king, Ahab, who was influenced by his idolatrous wife, Jezebel. Jehoram, husband of Athaliah (Ahab's daughter), and Ahaziah (Athaliah's son) followed the idolatry of the house of Ahab, and when Ahaziah died, Athaliah ruled Judah seeking to exterminate the Davidic seed. In this succession of idolatry and the decline of the Davidic dynasty, it is significant that the Davidic covenant is reconfirmed in 2 Chr 21:7, the last verse of the introduction to Jehoram's reign (2 Chr 21:2-7).

### 2. Synoptic Comparison

The text of 2 Chr 21:2-7 corresponds to 2 Kgs 8:16-19 of the Deuteronomistic history. The longer text of Chronicles is due mainly to the Chronicler's insertion of Jehoram's heinous sin of murdering his brothers in 2 Chr 21:2-4. Without the synchronic introductory formula of 2 Kgs 8:16 ('In the fifth year of King Joram son of Ahab of Israel, Jehoram son of King Jehoshaphat of Judah began to reign'), the Chronicler includes a fratricide account that is not found in Kings. Remarkably, the fratricide occurs before the introductory resumé of Jehoram (v. 5), which one would normally expect to be placed in the forefront of the unit. In 2 Kings 8, Jehoram's introductory resumé (v. 17) along with the synchronic introduction (v. 16) appear at the beginning of Jehoram's account. By locating Jehoram's heinous fratricide even before the introductory resumé formula, the Chronicler highlights the wickedness of Jehoram. In fact, Jehoram's killing of his brothers indicates not only his wickedness but also the danger he poses to the Davidic line.

Having inserted the account of Jehoram's fratricide, the Chronicler places an introductory resumé formula for Jehoram and negative assessment of him in vv. 5 and

6. Jehoram is unfavorably evaluated for his religious unfaithfulness to YHWH as v. 6a states:

He walked in the way of the kings of Israel, as the house of Ahab had done; for the daughter of Ahab was his wife.

2 Chr 21:13 gives a concrete meaning to the phrase ‘walking in the way of the kings of Israel, as the house of Ahab’, explaining it as Judah’s religious harlotry against YHWH:

But have walked in the way of the kings of Israel, *and have led Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem into unfaithfulness* (וַתִּזְנֶה) (אֶת־יְהוּדָה וְאֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם) as the house of Ahab led Israel into unfaithfulness, and because you also have killed your brothers, members of your father’s house, who were better than yourself.

As v. 13 states, Jehoram’s sins are two-fold: idolatry and fratricide. The two sins are already presented in the introduction of Jehoram’s account in 2 Chr 21:2-7.

The introductory resumé and negative assessment of Jehoram forms an *inclusio* with the concluding resumé formula and negative assessment of Jehoram in 2 Chr 21:20:

He was thirty-two years old when he began to reign; he reigned eight years in Jerusalem. He departed with no one’s regret. They buried him in the city of David, but not in the tombs of the kings.

Between the introduction of Jehoram’s account (2 Chr 21:2-7) and the concluding remark (2 Chr 21:20), there are specific incidents that depict Jehoram as unequivocally negative: Edom’s revolt against Judah (vv. 8-10a); Libnah’s revolt against Judah (v.10b); Jehoram’s apostasy (v. 11); Elijah’s threatening letter (vv. 12-15); the attack of Philistines and Arabs against Judah (vv. 16-17); and the horrible disease of Jehoram and his death (vv. 18-19). All these incidents contribute to the negative portrait of Jehoram and they are the Chronicler’s *Sondergut* except for the account of Edom and Libnah’s revolts. In this deep darkness of the Jehoram account,

v. 7, being paralleled with 2 Kgs 8:19, sheds a light of hope. Since some discrepancies exist between 2 Chr 21:7 and 2 Kgs 8:19, it is worthwhile comparing them in order to detect what the Chronicler thought of the Davidic dynasty.

## 2. 1. 2 Kgs 8:19//2 Chr 21:7

וְלֹא־אָבָה יְהוָה לְהַשְׁחִית אֶת־יְהוּדָה לְמַעַן דָּוִד עַבְדּוֹ  
כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר־לוֹ לָתֵת לוֹ נֵיר לְבָנָיו כָּל־הַיָּמִים

Yet the LORD would not destroy Judah, for the sake of his servant David, since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever. (2 Kgs 8:19)

וְלֹא־אָבָה יְהוָה לְהַשְׁחִית אֶת־בֵּית דָּוִיד לְמַעַן הַבְּרִית  
אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת לְדָוִיד וְכַאֲשֶׁר אָמַר לָתֵת לוֹ נֵיר וּלְבָנָיו  
כָּל־הַיָּמִים

Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David for the sake of the covenant that he had made with David, and since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever. (2 Chr 21:7, my translation)

Three different points are relevant for our discussion of the Chronicler's view of the Davidic covenant:

2 Kgs 8:19	2 Chr 21:7
יְהוּדָה ('Judah')	בֵּית דָּוִיד ('the house of David')
לְמַעַן דָּוִיד עַבְדּוֹ ('for the sake of David, his servant')	לְמַעַן הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת לְדָוִיד ('for the sake of the covenant that he made with David')
לְבָנָיו ('to his descendants')	וּלְבָנָיו ('and to his descendants')

With regard to the Chronicler's 'the house of David' (*contra* 'Judah'), scholars suggest different approaches. Curtis and Madsen suppose that Judah's captivity forced the Chronicler to make this change.<sup>306</sup> That is to say, it would be burdensome for the Chronicler to adopt the clause, 'But YHWH would not destroy Judah', considering

<sup>306</sup> Curtis & Madsen, *The Books of Chronicles*, 414.

Judah's destruction and the exile. The Chronicler thus restricted the promise to the house of David. This view is not convincing because *בֵּית דָּוִיד* *per se* refers to the Davidic dynasty, that is Judah. Nathan's oracle concerning the Davidic covenant clearly shows that to build the house of David is to build the Davidic kingdom:

I declare to you that *the LORD will build you a house*. When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and *I will establish his kingdom*. He shall build a house for me, and *I will establish his throne* forever. (1 Chr 17:10b-12)

Dillard, on the other hand, finds a clue for this divergence in the Chronicler's postexilic background.<sup>307</sup> According to Dillard, the Chronicler expresses his longing for the rise of the Davidic throne through the expression 'But YHWH would not destroy the house of David' at a time when Judah is restored under the rule of Persia but the Davidic throne is lost.<sup>308</sup> However, does the Chronicler believe that Judah is restored in his time? Though many of the Israelites returned from exile under the auspices of the Persian ruler and rebuilt the Temple, Judah (or the province of Yehud) is not independent under the rule of Persia. Hence, it is doubtful that the Chronicler believed Judah as restored thus causing the modification of 'Judah' to 'the house of David'.

Another approach is that of Japhet, who insists that the Chronicler, believing in individual retribution, replaced 'Judah' with 'the house of David' because the merit of the king would not protect Judah.<sup>309</sup> Japhet suggests that in Chronicles, an individual is awarded for his or her own merit just as an individual is punished for his or her own sin.<sup>310</sup> According to Japhet, since David's individual merit cannot benefit corporate Judah in Chronicles, he substituted it with 'the house of David'. The

---

<sup>307</sup> Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 166.

<sup>308</sup> Ibid.

<sup>309</sup> Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, 456.

<sup>310</sup> For further details of individual retribution in Chronicles, see Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, 156-165.

weakness of Japhet's argument is that 'the house of David' is also corporate, either synchronically or diachronically, just as 'Judah' is corporate. Though she acknowledges the element of ancestral merit in 2 Chr 21:7, she treats it as an unusual case that does not fit the Chronicler's scheme of individual retribution.<sup>311</sup>

Why, then, does the Chronicler use the phrase, **בֵּית דָּוִיד**? On the surface, the Chronicler achieves an effect of antithesis between 'the house of David' and 'the house of Ahab' of v.6:<sup>312</sup>

He walked in the way of the kings of Israel, as *the house of Ahab* had done; for the daughter of Ahab was his wife. He did what was evil in the sight of the LORD. Yet the LORD would not destroy *the house of David* because of the covenant that he had made with David... (2 Chr 21:6-7)

More substantially, the Chronicler aims to motivate the postexilic readers to remember the Davidic covenant by using the phrase, 'the house of David' which is more specific than the general term, 'Judah'. Why does the Chronicler want the postexilic Israelites to remember the Davidic covenant? He is motivated, I would submit, by his desire for the restoration of the Davidic throne.

Secondly, the Chronicler's direct mention of the covenant of David in his phrase, 'for the sake of the covenant that he made with David' (*contra* 'for the sake of David, his servant') reinforces the Chronicler's intention as we have described. Here, the Chronicler's specification is heightened by his: **הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת לְדָוִיד** ('the covenant that he made with David'). This is the only place in Chronicles where 'the covenant made with David' is explicitly mentioned. Lemke is somewhat hesitant to find the Chronicler's *Tendenz* here by attributing the difference to a minor variance.<sup>313</sup> However, as we have already discussed in 2 Chr 7:18, the Chronicler prefers specific covenant language to the more general phraseology of 1 Kgs 9:5.<sup>314</sup> Both these instances argue for the presence of the Chronicler's *Tendenz*:

---

<sup>311</sup> Ibid., 456.

<sup>312</sup> Hill, *1 & 2 Chronicles*, 512.

<sup>313</sup> Lemke, "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History," 171.

<sup>314</sup> See pp. 145-147 of this work.



Then I will establish your royal throne over Israel for ever, as *I spoke* (דִּבַּרְתִּי) to David your father. (1 Kgs 9:5a, my translation)

Then I will establish your royal throne, as *I covenanted* (כָּרַתִּי) with your father David. (2 Chr 7:18a, my translation)

Here, the Chronicler stresses the covenantal nature by using a more specific term of covenant, כָּרַתִּי (*contra* דִּבַּרְתִּי). The conspicuousness of the first two covenant-specific phrases of 2 Chronicles 21 lies in the full-scale negative assessment of Jehoram. The Chronicler's explicit mention of the Davidic covenant as the source of Judah's sustenance, despite the wholesale wickedness of Jehoram, points to the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant.<sup>315</sup>

The unconditional nature of the covenant is combined with its perpetuity in the next clause where the third discrepancy occurs:

כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר-לוֹ לָתֵת לוֹ נֵיר לְבָנָיו כָּל-הַיָּמִים

Since he said to him to give a lamp to him to his descendants all the days. (2 Kgs 8:19b)

וְכַאֲשֶׁר אָמַר לָתֵת לוֹ נֵיר וּלְבָנָיו כָּל-הַיָּמִים

And since he said to give a lamp to him and his descendants all the days. (2 Chr 21:7b)

While there is no נֵיר attached to לְבָנָיו in 2 Kgs 8:19, נֵיר is attached to לְבָנָיו in 2 Chr 21:7, so that the text may read smoothly. Moreover, the Chronicler conveys that the Davidic covenant has an effect on the posterity of David. Though this is a small touch, we can read into it the Chronicler's hope for the future restoration of the dynasty.<sup>316</sup>

In particular, within the context of the Davidic dynasty, 'giving a נֵיר ('lamp')' is a metaphor representing the continuity of this dynasty.<sup>317</sup> Rebutting the

---

<sup>315</sup> Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 305.

<sup>316</sup> Ibid.

<sup>317</sup> The form נֵיר occurs four times in the Old Testament: 1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19; 2 Chr 21:7. Paul Hanson suggests a different rendering of נֵיר as 'dominion' in his article, "The Song of Heshbon and David's NIR," *HTR* 61 (1968), 297-320. Whether נֵיר is identified as either 'lamp' (BDB, 633,

Chronicler's belief in the eternity of the Davidic dynasty, Riley claims that **נִיר** is an indicator of the Jerusalem Temple or its cultus.<sup>318</sup> According to Riley, 2 Chr 21:7 states that the Davidic dynasty needs to continue until the establishment of **נִיר**, that is, the Temple or the Temple cultus.<sup>319</sup> However, if **נִיר** refers to the Jerusalem Temple, Riley's view is untenable because the Jerusalem Temple was established in the Solomonic period, several decades before Jehoram's reign.

It is also unconvincing to view **נִיר** as referring to the Jerusalem temple cultus. In Riley's view, the Davidic dynasty continues in Jehoram's time despite his wickedness due to the uncompleted task of the Temple cultus.<sup>320</sup> He finds the completion of the Temple cultus during Josiah's reign, which is the beginning of the end of the Davidic dynasty in Chronicles:<sup>321</sup>

*After all this, when Josiah had set the temple in order (אַחֲרֵי כָּל-זֹאת), King Neco of Egypt went up to fight at Carchemish on the Euphrates, and Josiah went out against him. (2 Chr 35:20)*

Riley regards the circumstantial clause, **אַחֲרֵי כָּל-זֹאת אֲשֶׁר הָכִין יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ** **אֶת-הַבַּיִת** as an indication of the completion of the Temple cultus and the remainder of Chronicles (2 Chr 35:20b – 2 Chr 36) as the description of Judah's destruction. Josiah was killed by Neco's archers and his followers, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, took the steps necessary to ensure the dynastic collapse.

However, a close reading of the text reveals that the clause, **אַחֲרֵי כָּל-זֹאת** **אֲשֶׁר הָכִין יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ** **אֶת-הַבַּיִת** does not signal the completion of the Temple cultus

---

HALOT I, 697) or 'dominion' derived from 'yoke', in the context of the Davidic dynasty, 'giving a **נִיר**' signifies the continuity of the Davidic line. As Japhet observes, 1 Kgs 15:4 interprets the metaphor as the continuous Davidic line by 'setting up his son after him': 'Nevertheless for David's sake the LORD his God gave him a lamp in Jerusalem, *setting up his son after him*, and establishing Jerusalem'. See *I & II Chronicles*, 809-810,

<sup>318</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 173, 179.

<sup>319</sup> Ibid.

<sup>320</sup> Ibid., 179.

<sup>321</sup> Ibid.

but is the Chronicler's literary device for summing up a section and for introducing the following part.<sup>322</sup> In fact, Josiah's setting up (הִכִּין) the Temple designates the particular Passover celebration in the Temple narrated in 2 Chr 35:1-19, rather than the completion of the cultic system of the Temple. This summary clause ('After all this, when Josiah had set the Temple in order') also functions as a bridge to a new episode about Josiah's war against Neco, king of Egypt. As Japhet observes, there is a similar case in 2 Chr 32:1a:<sup>323</sup>

*After these things and these acts of faithfulness (אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים וְהַאֲמָתִים) King Sennacherib of Assyria came and invaded Judah.*

הַדְּבָרִים וְהַאֲמָתִים refers to Hezekiah's faithful service in the Temple of God as the previous verse reveals:

And every work that he undertook in the service of the house of God, and in accordance with the law and the commandments, to seek his God, he did with all his heart; and he prospered. (2 Chr 30:21)

In 2 Chr 32:1, the Chronicler likewise uses the literary device of a circumstantial summary clause to bridge the new episode of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah as he did to introduce a new account of Neco's invasion in 2 Chr 35:20. Just as the Chronicler compliments Hezekiah and his cultic faithfulness (2 Chr 29-31) before the new episode in 2 Chr 32:1, so also Josiah's cultic faithfulness is mentioned before the new episode in 2 Chr 35:1. Thus, the circumstantial clause of 2 Chr 35:20 ('*after all this, when Josiah had set the Temple in order*') is to be viewed as a literary device of recapitulation and anticipation. It is not the Chronicler's declaration of the completion of the Temple cultus.

Against the Chronicler's belief in the renewal of the Davidic dynasty, Pomykala asserts that the Chronicler's two alterations ('the house of David' instead of

<sup>322</sup> Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 1055.

<sup>323</sup> Ibid.

‘Judah’ and ‘for the sake of the covenant that he made with David’ instead of ‘for the sake of David, his servant’) only suggest YHWH’s commitment to Davidic dynasty rather than the idea that it continues without end.<sup>324</sup> Pomykala holds that the evidence lies in the 150 to 225 years between the fall of Judah and the Chronicler’s time.<sup>325</sup> However, Pomykala’s approach to the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant is too simplistic. As discussed above with regard to 1 Chronicles 17, YHWH’s נְסִיחָה for the Davidic house in Chronicles would not depart from it even after his chastisement.<sup>326</sup> When the period of God’s discipline of Israel is over, the Israelites were entitled to hope for the renewal of the Davidic dynasty based on YHWH’s נְסִיחָה promised to David. McKenzie’s statement aptly exemplifies my point:

The reign of Athaliah is particularly instructive in this regard. That there is no Davidide on the throne for six years is not seen by the Chronicler as negating the promise to David. Rather, it is the promise that accounts for the survival of Joash and his eventual replacement of Athaliah. In the Chronicler’s postexilic context this must have been a source of hope for the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. God had promised David an enduring dynasty; like Athaliah’s reign, the exile represented a hiatus that did not negate the promise. Moreover, the exile, like Athaliah’s reign, was preceded and even occasioned by wicked kings. But human wickedness does not nullify divine promise.<sup>327</sup>

### 3. Conclusion

2 Chr 21:7 witnesses the Chronicler’s firm belief in the renewal of the Davidic dynasty based on the Davidic covenant. In the midst of the full-scale negative assessment of Jehoram, the Chronicler explicitly mentions that God is not willing to destroy the Davidic kingdom because he made a covenant with David. It is remarkable that in Chronicles, the sole mention of the explicit phrase of the Davidic covenant (הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב לְדָוִד) occurs in the account of Jehoram’s heinous sins of idolatry and fratricide that endanger the Davidic line. The three divergencies

<sup>324</sup> Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynastic Tradition in Early Judaism*, 102.

<sup>325</sup> Ibid.

<sup>326</sup> See pp. 39-42 of this work.

<sup>327</sup> McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 312-313.

between 2 Chr 21:7 and its parallel text of 2 Kgs 8:19 are significant signals for understanding the Chronicler's view of the Davidic kingdom. With the first two covenant-specific phrases, the Chronicler rouses the postexilic readers' expectations for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty based on the covenant. In the third divergence, it is observed that the Chronicler emphasizes the efficacy of the promise for the posterity of David. In particular, God's granting a lamp to David and his descendants stresses the Chronicler's hope in the continuity of the Davidic line. For the Chronicler, this continuity is not necessarily without interruption; the cessation of the Davidic dynasty is not a sign of the breaking up or expiration of the Davidic covenant. Rather, the Chronicler finds hope for the renewal of the Davidic throne in the Davidic covenant, which is not abandoned even in the darkness of Jehoram's reign.

## X. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 23:1-3

### 1. Setting

In the history of the kingdom of Judah, Athaliah's reign (2 Chr 22:10-12) is conspicuous because it is the only period in which a non-Davidic line ruled over Judah. Upon the murder of Ahaziah by Jehu, Athaliah, Ahaziah's mother, sat on the throne of Judah presuming that no Davidic line survived. However, her presumption was incorrect as Joash was hidden and secretly raised by Jehoshabeath, wife of Jehoiada, the high priest. In the seventh year of Athaliah's reign, Jehoiada conspired to restore the Davidic kingdom by crowning Joash, the sole survivor of the Davidic line, as king.

2 Chr 23:1-3 concerns the beginning of Jehoida's counter-coup against Athaliah. Significantly, the Davidic covenant is included in Jehoida's proclamation to those assembled (v. 3). This is followed by Jehoida's specific instructions to the assembly for the coup (2 Chr 23:4-7).

### 2. Synoptic Comparison

2 Kgs 11:4 is the synoptic partner of 2 Chr 23:1-3:

2 Kgs 11:4	2 Chr 23:1-3
<p>וּבִשְׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִית שָׁלַח יְהוֹיָדָע וַיִּקַּח אֶת־שָׂרֵי הַמְּאֹת לִפְרִי וְלִרְצִים</p> <p>וַיָּבֵא אֹתָם אֵלָיו בֵּית יְהוָה וַיִּכְרֹת לָהֶם בְּרִית וַיִּשָּׁבַע אֹתָם בְּבֵית יְהוָה וַיֵּרָא אֹתָם אֶת־בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ</p>	<p>וּבִשְׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִית הִתְחַזַּק יְהוֹיָדָע וַיִּקַּח אֶת־שָׂרֵי הַמְּאֹת לְעֲזָרָהוּ בֶן־יִרְחָם וְלִישְׁמַעְיָאל בֶּן־יְהוֹחָנָן וְלִעֲזָרְיָהוּ בֶן־עֹבֶד וְאֶת־מַעֲשִׂיהוּ בֶן־עֲדִיָּהוּ וְאֶת־אֱלִישָׁפָט בֶּן־זָכְרִי עַמּוּ בְּבֵרִית וַיִּסְבּוּ בִיהוּדָה וַיִּקְבְּצוּ אֶת־הַלְוִיִּם מִכָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה וְרָאשֵׁי הָאָבוֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּבֵאוּ אֶל־יְרוּשָׁלַם וַיִּכְרֹת כָּל־הַקָּהָל בְּרִית בְּבֵית הָאֱלֹהִים עִם־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הִנֵּה בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ יִמְלֹךְ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה</p>

<p>But in the seventh year Jehoiada summoned the captains of the Carites and of the guards</p> <p>and had them come to him in the house of the LORD. He made a covenant with them and put them under oath in the house of the LORD; then he showed them the king's son.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">עַל־בְּנֵי דָוִיד</p> <p>But in the seventh year Jehoiada took courage, and entered into a compact with the commanders of the hundreds, Azariah son of Jeroham, Ishmael son of Jehohanan, Azariah son of Obed, Maaseiah son of Adaiah, and Elishaphat son of Zichri. <sup>2</sup> They went around through Judah and gathered the Levites from all the towns of Judah, and the heads of families of Israel, and they came to Jerusalem. <sup>3</sup> Then the whole assembly made a covenant with the king in the house of God. Jehoiada said to them, 'Here is the king's son! Let him reign, as the LORD promised concerning the sons of David'.</p>
---	--

As the above comparison shows, 2 Chr 23:1-3 is longer than 2 Kgs 11:4 and some differences exist between the two texts. The Chronicler list more names of the participants of Jehoiada's conspiracy. Whereas in the 2 Kings account, Jehoida conspires with the captains of the Carites and of the guard (שָׂרֵי הַמֵּאוֹת לְכָרִי וְלָרָצִים), who are the foreign bodyguards of the king (2 Kgs 11:4),<sup>328</sup> the Chronicler presents more co-conspirators: the five captains of hundreds (...שָׂרֵי הַמֵּאוֹת), Levites from all the cities of Judah, and the heads of the families of Israel. The Chronicler's כָּל־הַקָּהָל ('all the assembly') in 2 Chr 23:3 demonstrates unequivocally a larger participation in the coup. As 'all Israel' (כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל) gathered in Hebron for David's coronation (1 Chr 11:1) and 'all the assembly' (כָּל־הַקָּהָל) joined in David's bringing of the ark (1 Chr 13:4), כָּל־הַקָּהָל made a covenant with the Davidic king, Joash, in 2 Chr 23:3. It is significant that the Chronicler designates Joash as king even before the completion of the coup. This early designation of Joash as king betrays the Chronicler's conviction that Joash is the only legitimate king of Judah even *before* his coronation.<sup>329</sup>

This large group of supporters match the Chronicler's use of a more spacious place for the gathering of the assembly. While the gathering place is the Temple in 2

<sup>328</sup> BDB, 501.

<sup>329</sup> Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 315.

Kgs 11:4 (וַיָּבֵא אֹתָם אֵלָיו בֵּית יְהוָה) ‘And he had them come to him (in) the house of God’) the Chronicler presents Jerusalem as the gathering place (וַיָּבֵאוּ אֶל-יְרוּשָׁלַם, ‘And they came to Jerusalem’). It is also noteworthy that while the Deuteronomist describes the partakers’ gathering in the clause, וַיָּבֵא אֹתָם (the *hifil* form of בוא with the object אֹתָם), the Chronicler renders the partakers of the coup as active voluntary supporters by using וַיָּבֵאוּ. The implication of the larger and more proactive support for the coup is to enhance its justification. That is to say, the Chronicler carries a much stronger message than the Deuteronomist that the Davidic line is to be restored in the kingdom of Judah as YHWH promised to the Davidic family.

The difference in the Chronicler’s account of the coup-supporters is qualitative as well as quantitative. While the coup in 2 Kgs 11:4 unfolds only with the assistance of the Carites, the Chronicler’s account includes important leaders of the Israelites community, such as the Levites and family heads.<sup>330</sup> רָאשֵׁי הָאָבוֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל (‘the heads of the fathers of Israel’) are a group who play an important part elsewhere in Chronicles. They are present as a representative of Israel in David’s final address (1 Chr 29:6), in Solomon’s worship at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:2), and in Solomon’s installation of the ark in the Temple (2 Chr 5:2). Additionally, Jehoshaphat appoints them as the administrators of the Judgment of YHWH (2 Chr 19:8). ‘The heads of the fathers of Israel’, more so than ‘the heads of the fathers of Judah’, reflect the theologically idealistic representative of the whole of Israel.<sup>331</sup> In sum, Jehoiada’s rebellion with the support of a large group of people is no longer a coup. It is, in the Chronicler’s conception, a grassroots revolution! For the Chronicler, it may be more appropriate to consider it as Jehoiada’s reformation.

<sup>330</sup> Some argue that the five captains over hundreds in 2 Chr 23:1 are the Levites (Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 271; Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 315; McKenzie, *1-2 Chronicles*, 309), but this assertion is without certainty. Citing Kalimi’s work, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten*, 71-72, McKenzie states that all the names in 2 Chr 23:1 occur in other lists of priests and Levites in Chronicles, but, in fact, Kalimi does not say that all the names in 2 Chr 23:1 are the names of priests and Levites in other places of Chronicles. In fact, ‘Elishaphat’ as priest or Levite, does not occur in Chronicles. As Japhet holds, the names are too common to be used for their Levitical identity and the particular title, שָׂרֵי הַמֵּאוֹת (‘captains of the hundreds’) does not attest in Chronicles for the Levites (*I & II Chronicles*, 830).

<sup>331</sup> Johnstone, *I & II Chronicles II*, 123.



The Davidic covenant is placed on the lips of Jehoiada in 2 Chr 23:3b:

וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הִנֵּה בֶן־הַמֶּלֶךְ יִמְלֹךְ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה  
עַל־בְּנֵי דָוִד

And he said to them. ‘Behold the son of the king! Let him rule as the Lord spoke to the descendants of David!’ (my translation)

Jehoida’s statement corresponds to the last clause of 2 Kgs 11:4:

וַיֵּרָא אֲתָם אֶת־בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ

Then he (Jehoida) showed them the king’s son.

The Chronicler’s insertion of the Davidic covenant itself implies his longing for the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom. Riley, however, opposes this implication. Rather, he believes that Jehoida’s coup is to be read in the context of the reign of the non-Davidic usurper and not of the lost kingdom.<sup>332</sup> According to Riley, when there is a Davidide, he should be a king, but the promise does not speak of the permanent installation of the Davidic dynasty.<sup>333</sup> However, we do not need to assume that there was no available Davidide who survived in the Chronicler’s time. Riley argues that the precedence of בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ as a subject before the verb, יִמְלֹךְ in 2 Chr 23:3b is atypical in terms of word order and it reveals the Chronicler’s interest in the coup against a non-Davidide when a Davidide survives.<sup>334</sup> The inverted word order indicates the Chronicler’s emphasis on the Davidide. However, there is no implication in this word order that the Chronicler emphasizes the Davidide only when a Davidide exists. In the postexilic context, the plea, ‘Let him rule as the Lord spoke to the descendants of David!’ resounds with the aspiration of a Davidide sitting upon the throne.

### 3. Conclusion

---

<sup>332</sup> Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 124.

<sup>333</sup> Ibid.

<sup>334</sup> Ibid

Not only the Davidic covenant on the lips of Jehoida in 2 Chr 23:3, but the Chronicles' textual pluses and divergencies in comparison with 2 Kgs 11:4 reveal a more thorough justification for Jehoida's coup in Chronicles. The larger list of the partakers of the coup (2 Chr 23:1) with the inclusion of important figures such as the Levites and the heads of the fathers of Israel (2 Chr 23:2), and the explicit designation of the participants, כָּל-הַקָּהָל (2 Chr 23:3), witness widespread support for Jehoida's restoration of the Davidic line. Furthermore, the Chronicler renders the partakers voluntarily as part of the coup by the term, וַיֵּבֹאוּ (contra אֵתֶם וַיֵּבֹאוּ of 2 Kgs 11:4) in 2 Chr 23:2. The Chronicler, as a meticulous writer, does not forget to designate Jerusalem (contra the Temple of 2 Kgs 11:4) as the place of assembly for the large group of partakers of the coup. Also, the early designation of 'king' to Joash even before the completion of the coup (2 Chr 23:3) enhances the legitimacy of the restoration of the Davidic line. The Chronicler reveals in his justification of Jehoida's restoration of the Davidic king a longing for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom in his own postexilic time.

## XI. Conclusion

The foregoing investigation of all the texts of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles (1 Chr 17:1-27; 22:6-13; 28:2-10; 2 Chr 1:8-10; 6:3-17, 40-42; 7:17-22; 13:1-22; 21:2-7; 23:1-3) has been conducted to answer the main question of this research: 'Does the Book of Chronicles support in the Davidic covenant the restoration of the Davidic kingdom, or does it replace that promise with the Temple and its cultus?' A close reading of the nine texts which mention the Davidic covenant reveals that the Chronicler, as the author of the book of Chronicles, is consistent in putting forth his hope for the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom in the postexilic age. Both the synoptic texts of Chronicles and Samuel-Kings and the non-synoptic passages witness the Chronicler's longing for the revival of the royal house of David.

The synoptic texts are as follows: 1 Chr 17:1-27; 2 Chr 1:8-10; 2 Chr 6:3-17; 40-42; 2 Chr 7:17-22; 2 Chr 13:1-22; 2 Chr 21:2-7; 2 Chr 23:1-3. The text of 1 Chr 17:1-27 takes prime position in the discussion of the Davidic covenant, not just among the synoptic texts but among all the texts that deal with the dynastic promise in Chronicles, because it presents the divine conferral of the royal promise to the Davidic house; the other Davidic covenant texts either refer to or rely upon it. In particular, our investigation of the crucial divergence between the two texts, 'Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever' (2 Sam 7:16) and 'I will confirm him in my house and in my kingdom forever' (1 Chr 17:14) leads us to conclude that the Temple and its cultus do not replace the Davidic dynasty in Chronicles. Rather, the Chronicler enhances the role of the Davidic house in the cultic institution of the Temple.

It was also observed that the Chronicler faithfully includes the Davidic covenant. For instance, Nathan's oracle in 1 Chr 17:1-27 agrees closely with 2 Sam 7:1-29, the most significant text of the Davidic covenant in the Deuteronomistic history. Moreover, in 2 Chr 1:8-10, the Chronicler rather conspicuously includes the Davidic covenant with a jussive form (v. 9), which is not present in its synoptic text, 1 Kgs 3:7-8.

It was also argued that the Chronicler underscores the Davidic covenant by presenting the covenant or covenant-specific terms. At the end of Solomon's Temple dedication prayer, the Chronicler inserts God's promise through David (2 Chr 6:42, *contra* the divine promise through Moses of 1 Kgs 8:52). However, and despite the priority of the Davidic covenant, the Chronicler does not appear to have suppressed the Mosaic-Sinai covenant in order to magnify the Davidic covenant. The Chronicler prefers a covenant-specific term, 'to covenant' (2 Chr 7:18) to a generic term, 'to speak' (1 Kgs 9:5); he also chooses the phrases, 'the house of David' (*contra* 'Judah' of 2 Kgs 8:19) and 'for the sake of the covenant that he made with David' (*contra* 'for the sake of his servant David' of 2 Kgs 8:19) in 2 Chr 21:7

We also discovered that in the synoptic texts that there are circumlocutory elements that have been included because of the Davidic covenant. In 2 Chronicles 13, the Chronicler presents the name and genealogy of the speaker of the Davidic covenant favorably: 'Abijah' (*contra* 'Abijam' of 1 Kings), and 'Michayahu, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah' (2 Chr 13:2, *contra* 'Maacah, daughter of Abishalom' of 1 Kgs 15:2). If 'Abijam' and 'Maacah, daughter of Abishalom' of 1 Kings carries pagan and rebellious elements, then the Chronicler's 'Abijah' and 'Michayahu, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah' import divine and Israelite elements, thereby enhancing the validity of the covenant. Abijah's speech begins with the command phrase, 'Hear me!'; it was shown that this was a catchword used in the mouth of God's approved agent to articulate the theology of Chronicles. In addition, the holy war motif in the war narrative between Abijah and Jeroboam, and Abijah's complete victory over Jeroboam both serve to reinforce Abijah's proclamation of the Davidic covenant. Moreover, the Chronicler's use of strong covenant terminology, 'covenant of salt', in 2 Chr 13:5 points to his belief in the perpetuity of the Davidic kingdom.

When we compared the account of Jehoida's coup against Athaliah 2 Chr 23:1-3 with its parallel 2 Kgs 11:4, it was suggested that, besides the explicit insertion of the Davidic covenant, other indirect factors heighten the centrality of the Davidic dynasty in this text. These include the large number of participants in the coup, the participation of prominent figures, the explicit designation 'all the assembly' as

supporters, the subsequent large gathering place, and the calling of Joash as ‘king’ even before the completion of the coup.

Out of the nine texts in Chronicles that mention the Davidic covenant, two are non-synoptic texts: 1 Chr 22:6-13 and 1 Chr 28:4-5. The Chronicler’s inclusion of the dynastic promise in the non-synoptic texts *per se* reveals his concern for the Davidic house. Though there are arguments for considering 1 Chr 28:4-5 as a secondary expansion, those arguments do not withstand close scrutiny. Rather, 1 Chr 28:4-5 is part of the cohesive chiasmic structure of 1 Chr 28:4-7.

Furthermore, across both the synoptic and non-synoptic texts of Chronicles that discuss the Davidic covenant, there is other evidence that highlights the Chronicler’s hope for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty. The Chronicler often attaches ‘*ôlām*’ to the Davidic covenant (e.g., 1 Chr 17:12, 14, 23, 27; 22:10; 28:4, 7; 2 Chr 13:5; 21:7). Since its semantic range varies from ‘far off’ to ‘eternal’ based on its context, it was argued that the original context of the Davidic covenant of Nathan’s oracle in 1 Chronicles 17 is key to narrowing down the meaning of this word. In the investigation of ‘*ôlām*’ in 1 Chronicles 17, it has been argued that its meaning is ‘eternal’ rather than ‘far off’ in the future.

It was also found that both unconditional and conditional elements occur in Chronicles and that the former intends the revival of the Davidic dynasty. In terms of the inclusion of unconditionality and conditionality, the nine texts relating to the Davidic covenant may be divided into four groups: unconditional (1 Chr 17:11-14; 2 Chr 13:5; 21:6-7; 23:1-3), conditional (2 Chr 6:3-17; 7:17-22), both unconditional and conditional (1 Chr 22:10-13; 28:4-7), and neutral (2 Chr 1:8). The retention of both the unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant does not, however, mean that the Chronicler was inconsistent. Rather, in my view, the Chronicler views the two as complementary. The royal promise is conditional in the sense that the Davidic kings are disciplined and punished, and the kingdom ceases to exist when it does not meet the conditions set down by YHWH; it is unconditional in that YHWH’s mercy will never depart from the kingdom.

The Chronicler’s equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH’s kingdom (1 Chr 17:14; 28:5; 2 Chr 13:8) enhances the significance of the Davidic dynasty.

Contrary to the common assumption that the Chronicler deprives the Davidic house of ownership over the kingdom by this equation, it has been argued that in this designation the Chronicler deliberately expresses the heightened importance of the Davidic dynasty.

Although it is often asserted that the Chronicler's preservation of the Davidic covenant supports his anti-Samaritan polemic rather than any interest in the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, it was argued that a close reading of the text shows that the Chronicler instead wants to include the northern kingdom of Israel.

In order to downplay the importance of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles, some scholars insist that the protagonist of Chronicles is Solomon, not David. However, the texts betray the view that the Chronicler does not regard David and Solomon in competition; rather, the divine blessing upon Solomon is to be understood under the umbrella of the Davidic blessing.

Our analysis of the Chronicler's presentation of the Davidic covenant sheds some light upon other issues concerning his views of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom, which are not discussed in this work, such as the elaborate genealogy of the Davidide Zerubbabel in 1 Chr 3:17-22, the lack of hatred of other nations, and the exclusion of the account of Jehoiachin's release. If, as we have argued, the Chronicler hopes for the resurgence of the Davidic house when he uses the Davidic covenant, it would be natural to assume that the same Chronicler would include the Davidides' detailed genealogy in his search for their restoration. Moreover, the absence of hatred of other nations in Chronicles is not an indicator of his disinterest in the future restoration of the Davidic kingdom. As argued above in the discussion of the Chronicler's portrayal of the Davidic covenant, his expectation of the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom is political rather than messianic. Thus, in my view, the Chronicler would not have needed to embrace the hatred of other nations, which is a common feature of messianic prophecy within the prophetic literature.

Meanwhile, the Chronicler's exclusion of the account of the release of Jehoiachin, which closes the Deuteronomistic history, is often used by scholars to suggest that the Chronicler was indifferent to the Davidides and their revival. However, Chronicles ends with a stronger restoration account; that is, the Cyrus edict

concerning the release of the Jews (2 Chr 36:23). Whereas Jehoiada is released from prison but is still confined in Babylon, the Cyrus edict releases Jews from Babylon to their own land. In other words, as I have argued, as the Chronicler expresses his hope for the restoration in his presentation of the Davidic covenant, he also seem to betray his longing for the revival of the Davidic kingdom by placing Cyrus' edict of the Jews' release at the end.

After a close reading of all the texts that mention the Davidic covenant in Chronicles, we find that the Davidic covenant is not absorbed into the Temple and its cultus. For the Chronicler, the Davidic kingdom takes its rightful place *alongside* the Temple and its cultus. The two foci of Abijah's speech (2 Chronicles 13), which concern the eternity of the Davidic kingdom and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple, mirror the Chronicler's intentions. As I see it, the Davidic covenant in Chronicles is not simply a narrated history or the account of past historical figures; rather, it is the Chronicler's own profession of his belief. The Chronicler's intensification of the royal promise in Chronicles shows that he is not satisfied simply with a Temple-centered priestly society. Rather, he longs for further change through the restoration of the lost kingdom by appealing to the Davidic covenant. The Davidic covenant expresses both the preservation of the Davidic kingdom in the preexilic period and its restoration in the post-exilic period.

## Bibliography

- Abadie, Philippe. "Pérennité Dynastique ou Éternité du Temple ? Deux Lectures d'un Même Oracle (2 S 7 et 1 Ch 17)," *Analyse Narrative et Bible*. eds. Focant, Camille and Wénin, André. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004.
- Abegg, M. Jr., Flint, P., Ulrich, E. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999.
- Ackroyd, P. R. "History and Theology in the Writings of the Chronicler," *CTM* 38 (1967): 501-515.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Theology of the Chronicler," *LTQ* 8 (1973): 101-116.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Chronicler in His Age*, JSOTSup 101. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Albright, W. F. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1942.
- Allen, Leslie C. *The Greek Chronicles Part I*, VTSup 25. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Greek Chronicles Part II*, VTSup 27. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "1 & 2 Chronicles," *NIB* III: 299-659.
- Anderson, Niels-Erik A. "The Role of the Queen Mother in Israelite Society," *CBQ* 45 (1983): 179-194.
- Anderson, Robert T. "The Elusive Samaritan Temple," *BA* 54 (1991): 104-107.
- Auld, A. G. *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "What Was the Main Source of the Book of Chronicles?" *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, ed. M. P. Graham and S. L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic press, 1999, 91-100.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Samuel at the Threshold*, SOTSMS. Ashgate: Aldershot, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Synoptic David: The View from Chronicles," *Raising Up a Faithful Exegete*, ed. K. L. Noll and Brooks Schramm. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010, 117-128.
- Avioz, Michael, "Josephus' Retelling of Nathan's Oracle (2 Samuel 7)," *SJOT* 20 (2006): 9-17.



- Baltzer, K. "Das Ende des Staates Juda und die Messias-Frage," *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen*. ed. R. Rendtorff and K. Koch. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961, 33-43.
- Barstad, H. M. "History and the Hebrew Bible," *Can a 'History of Israel' Be Written?*, JSOTSup 245. ed. L. L. Grabbe. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1997, 37-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *History and the Hebrew Bible: Studies in Ancient Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography*, FAT 61. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Barr, James. *Biblical Words for Time*. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- Batten, Loring W. *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1913.
- Becker, Joachim. *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*. trans. David E. Green. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1980.
- Bendavid, Abba, *Parallels in the Bible*. Jerusalem: Carta, 1972.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. "'They Saw that His Forehead was Leprous' (2 Chr 26:20) The Chronicler's Narrative on Uzziah's Leprosy," *Purity and Holiness*. eds. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 61-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*, SSN 52. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Benzinger, I. *Die Bücher der Könige*. KHC. Leipzig: Freiburg I. B., 1899.
- Beuken, W. A. M. "Isa. 55, 3-5: The Reinterpretation of David," *Bijdragen* 35 (1974): 49-64.
- Berger Yitzhak, *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi to Chronicles*, BJS 345. Providence: Brown University, 2007.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel 25-48*, NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Botterweck, G. J. "Zur Eigenart der chronistischen Davidgeschichte," *TQ* 136 (1956): 402-435.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "יָדָע," *TDOT* V: 448-481.
- Braun, R. "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles," *JBL* 92 (1975): 503-516.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles," *JBL* 95 (1976): 581-590.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *1 Chronicles*, WBC. Waco: Word, 1986.

- Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Brin, Gershon, *The Concept of the Time in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Brooke, George J. "The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran," *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. VTSup 113. eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, W. Brian Aucker. Leiden: Brill, 2006, 35-48.
- Brosius, Maria. *The Persians*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Brueggemann, W. *David's Truth*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Brunet, A. M. "Le Chroniste et Ses Sources," *RB* 60 (1953): 481-508.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La Théologie du Chroniste: Théocratie et Messianisme," *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica* vol. I. eds. J. Coppens, A. Descamps, É. Massaux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1959, 384-397.
- Caquot, A. "Les 'Grâces de David' A propos d'Isaïe 55/3b," *Semitica* 15 (1965): 45-59.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," *RTP* 99 (1966): 110-120.
- Carpenter, Eugene. "עֶבֶר," *NIDOTTE* III: 304-309.
- Cataldo, Jeremiah W. *A Theocratic Yehud?: Issues of Government in a Persian Period*, LHBOTS 498. New York: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Clements, R. E. *Jeremiah*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1988.
- Coggins, R. J. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Collins, John J. "The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. ed. Timothy H. Lim. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000, 199-217.
- Coppens, J. *Le messianisme royal*, LD 54. Paris: Cerf, 1968.
- Cross, F. M. "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," *HTR* 59 (1966): 201-211.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," *JBL* 94 (1975): 4-18.

- Curtis, E. A. & Madsen, A. A. *The Books of Chronicles*, ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1910.
- Deboys, David G. "History and Theology in the Chronicler's Portrayal of Abijah," *Bib* 71 (1990): 48-62.
- De Vries, S. J. "The Schema of Dynastic Endangerment in Chronicles," *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society* 7 (1987): 59-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles," *JBL* 107 (1988): 636-639.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *1 and 2 Chronicles*, FOTL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Dietrich, M., Loretz, O., Sanmartin, J. *Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Uagrit*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag: 1976.
- Dillard, Raymond B. *2 Chronicles*, WBC. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Driver, G. R. "The Original Form of the Name 'Yahweh': evidence and conclusions," *ZAW* 46 (1928): 7-25.
- Driver, S. R. "The Speeches in Chronicles," *The Expositor*. ed. Nicoll, W. Robertson. Paternoster Row: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895, 241-308.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Deuteronomy*, ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902.
- Dumbrell, W. J. "The Davidic Covenant," *RTR* 39 (1980): 40-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Purpose of the Books of Chronicles," *JETS* 27 (1984): 257-266.
- Dyck, Jonathan E. "The Ideology of Identity in Chronicles," *Ethnicity and the Bible*. ed. Mark G. Brett. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996, 89-116.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Endres, John C., Millar, William R., Burns, John Barclay. *Chronicles and Its Synoptic Parallels in Samuel, Kings, and Related Biblical Texts*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1989.
- Engler, Hans. "The Attitude of the Chronicler toward the Davidic Monarchy," Th. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1967.
- Eslinger, L. *House of God or House of David*, JSOTSup 164. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Freedman, D. N. "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 436-442.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Divine Commitment and Human Obligation," *Int* 18 (1964): 419-431.

- Frymer-Kensky, Tikva. "The Planting of Man: A Study in Biblical Imagery," *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East*. eds. John H. Marks and Robert M. Good. Connecticut: Four Quarters Publishing Company, 1987, 129-136.
- Garcia Martínez, Florentino and Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls I*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Dead Sea Scrolls II*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Gileadi, Avraham, "The Davidic Covenant: A Theological Basis for Corporate Protection," *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration*, ed. Avraham Gileadi. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988, 157-163.
- Goldingay, John. "The Chronicler as a Theologian," *BTB* 5 (1975): 99-126.
- Gooding, D. W. *Relics of Ancient Exegesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Gordon, C. H. *Introduction to Old Testament Times*. New Jersey: Ventnor Publishers, 1953.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period II*. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Graham, M. P., Hoglund, K. G., McKenzie, S. L. *The Chronicler as Historian*, JSOTSup 238. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Graham, M. P. and McKenzie S. L. *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, JSOTSup 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Gray, John. *I & II Kings*, OTL. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Grisanti, Michael A. 'דָּוִד' *NIDOTTE* II: 461-466.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Davidic Covenant," *TMSJ* 10 (1999): 233-250.
- Hanson, Paul D. "The Song of Heshbon and David's NIR," *HTR* 61 (1968): 297-320.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The People Called*. New York: Haper & Row, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism (Genre)," *ABD* I: 279-280.
- Hill, Andrew E. *1 & 2 Chronicles*, NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_ “On David’s “Taking” and “Leaving” Concubines (2 Samuel 5:13; 15:16),” *JBL* 125 (2006): 129-139.

Hoffner, Harry A. “גִּיָּת,” *TDOT* II: 111-116.

Hognessius, Kjell. *The Text of 2 Chronicles 1-16*, CB. Stockholom: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003.

Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah 2*, Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Horsley, Richard, “Messianic Movements in Judaism,” *ABD* IV: 791-797.

Howard, David M. Jr. “The Case for Kingship in the Old Testament narrative Books and the Psalms,” *TrinJ* 9 (1988): 19-35.

\_\_\_\_\_ “The Case for Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets,” *WTJ* 52 (1990): 101-115.

Huffmon, Herbert B. “The Treaty Background of Hebrew גִּיָּת,” *BASOR* 181 (1966): 31-37.

Im, Tae-Soo. *Das Davidbild in den Chronikbüchern*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1985.

Ishida, T. *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel*, BZAW 142. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.

Japhet, Sara. “The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew,” *VT* 18 (1968): 332-372.

\_\_\_\_\_ “Interchanges of Verbal Roots in Parallel Texts in Chronicles,” *HS* 28 (1987): 19-50.

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Ideology of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*, BEATAJ 9. trans. A. Barber. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_ “The Temple in the Restoration Period: Reality and Ideology,” *USQR* 44 (1990): 195-251.

\_\_\_\_\_ *I & II Chronicles*, OTL. Louisville: Westminster, 1993.

Jarick, John. *1 Chronicles*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_ *2 Chronicles*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007.

Jenni, E. “Messiah, Jewish,” *IDB* IV: 360-365.

\_\_\_\_\_ “Time,” *IDB* IV: 642-649.

\_\_\_\_\_ “עוֹלָם,” *THAT* II., ed., E. Jenni and C. Westermann. München:

- Theologischer Verlag, 1979, 228-243.
- Jeremias, Jörg, *The Book of Amos*, OTL. trans. Stott, Douglas W. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- Johnstone, William. *1 and 2 Chronicles I*, JSOTSup 253. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *1 and 2 Chronicles II*, JSOTSup 254. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Jones, Douglas R. *Jeremiah*, NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Jones, G. H. “‘Holy War’ or ‘Yahweh War’?,” *VT* 25 (1975): 642-658.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “From Abijam to Abijah,” *ZAW* 106 (1994): 420-434.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Concept of Holy War,” *The World of Ancient Israel*. ed. R. E. Clements. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 299-321.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities V*. trans. H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus. London: William Heinemann, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities VI*. trans. Ralph Marcus. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jewish Antiquities IX*. trans. Ralph Marcus. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Kaiser, Walter C. “The Blessing of David: The Charter for Humanity,” *The Law and the Prophets*, ed. John H Skilton. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1974, 298-318.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Toward an Old Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Unfailing Kindnesses Promised to David: Isaiah 55:3,” *JSOT* 45 (1989): 91-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Toward an Old Testament Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.
- Kalimi, Isaac, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Chronicles: Historical Writing and Literary Devices*, Biblical Encyclopaedia Library 18. Jerusalem: Bialik, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2004.
- Kartveit, Magnar. *The Origin of the Samaritans*, VTSup 128. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Kaufman, Yeheskel. "The Messianic Idea: The Real and the Hidden Son of David," *El Ha 'Ayin* 5 (1961): 1-15.

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Religion of Israel*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1969.

Kautzsch, E. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. trans. A. E. Cowley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1910.

Keil, C. F. *The Books of Chronicles*, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. trans. Andrew Harper. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1872

Kellermann, D. "נִרְ," *TDOT* X: 14-24.

Kelly, Brian E. *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles*, JSOTSup 211. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Messianic Elements in the Chronicler's Work," *The Lord's Anointed*, ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, Gordon J. Wenham. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995, 249-264.

Keown, Gerald L., Scarlise, Pamela J., Smothers, Thomas G. *Jeremiah 26-52*, WBC. Waco: Word Books, 1995.

Kidner, Derek F. "Old Testament Perspective on War," *EvQ* 56 (1985): 99-113.

Klein, Ralph W. "Abijah's Campaign Against the North (II Chr 13) - What were the Chronicler's Sources?," *ZAW* 95 (1983): 210-217.

\_\_\_\_\_ *1 Chronicles*, Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Secession and Dynastic Oracle in 1 Kings 11," *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society* 7 (1987): 159-172.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Battling Against Yahweh (2 CHR 13:2-20)," *RB* 100 (1993): 511-532.

\_\_\_\_\_ "David's Relation to Moses: The Contexts, Content and Conditions of the Davidic Promises," *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, JSOTSup 270, ed. John Day. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 91-118.

\_\_\_\_\_ *1 Chronicles 1-9*, AB. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_ *1 Chronicles 10-29*, AB. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

Koehler, Ludwig and Baumgartner, Walter. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* I. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* II. Leiden:

- Brill, 2001.
- Kraeling, Emil G. *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Kruse, Heinz. "David's Covenant," *VT* 35 (1985): 139-164.
- Kumar, S. Ananda. "Culture and the Old Testament," *Down to Earth*. eds. Robert T. Coote and John Stott. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, 33-47.
- Kuntzmann, Raymond. "Le Trône de Dieu dans l'Oeuvre du Chroniste," *Le Trône de Dieu*. ed. Marc Philonenko. Tübingen: Mohr, 1993, 19-27.
- Latto, Antti. *A Star is Rising*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Lemke, W. E. "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History," Th. D. diss., Harvard University, 1963.
- Lescow, Theodor. "Das Geburtsmotiv in den messianischen Weissagungen," *ZAW* 79 (1967): 172-207.
- Levinson, Jon D. "The Davidic Covenant and its modern interpreters," *CBQ* 41 (1979): 205-219.
- Lim, Timothy H. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Origins and Emergence of Midrash in Relation to the Hebrew Bible," *Encyclopedia of Midrash II*. eds. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery Peck. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Lind, Millard C. "Paradigm of Holy War in the Old Testament," *BR* 16 (1971): 16-31.
- Marsh, John. *The Fullness of Time*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1952.
- Mason, R. *Preaching the Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Mays, James L. *Amos*. London: SCM Press, 1976.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. *1 Samuel*, AB. New York: Doubleday, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *2 Samuel*, AB. New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- McCarthy, D. J. "II Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," *JBL* 84 (1965): 131-138.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "b<sup>c</sup>rit in Old Testament History and Theology," *Bib* 53 (1972): 110-121.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Covenant*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973.



\_\_\_\_\_ Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 25-44.

McComiskey, Thomas E. *The Covenants of Promise*. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.

McConville, J. G. *Chronicles*. Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_ “Ezra-Nehemiah and the Fulfilment of Prophecy,” *VT* 36 (1986): 205-224.

McKenzie, Steven L. *The Chronicler’s Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, HSM 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_ “The Typology of the Davidic Covenant,” *The Land that I will Show You*, eds. J. Andrew Dearman and M. Patrick Graham. JSOTSup 343. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_ *1-2 Chronicles*, AOTC. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004.

Martínez, Florentino García and Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls I*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Dead Sea Scrolls II*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Meek, Theophile J. “The Code of Hammurabi,” *ANET*. ed. James B. Pritchard. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950, 163-180.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *King and Messiah*, CB. Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1976.

Montgomery, James A. *The Books of Kings*, ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1976.

Morrison, Martha A. “The Jacob and Laban Narrative in Light of Near Eastern Sources,” *BA* 46 (1983): 155-164.

Mosis, R. *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*. Freiburg: Herder, 1973.

Muilenburg, James. “The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations,” *VT* 9 (1959): 347-365.

Murray, Donald F. “Dynasty, People, and the Future: The Message of Chronicles,” *JSOT* 58 (1993): 71-92.

Myers, J. M. *1 Chronicles*, AB. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_ *2 Chronicles*, AB. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_ *Ezra-Nehemiah*, AB. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

- Nel, Philip J. “מִלֵּךְ,” *NIDOTTE* II: 957-958.
- Newsome, J. D. “Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler’s Purpose,” *JBL* 94 (1975): 201-217.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986.
- Nicholson, E. W. *Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *God and His People*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Nicoles, Emile. “בְּהָרִי,” *NIDOTTE* I: 638-642.
- Noordtzi, A. “Les Intentions du Chroniste,” *RB* 49 (1940): 161-168.
- North, R. “The Theology of the Chronicler,” *JBL* 82 (1963): 379-381.
- Noth, M. *Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Laws in the Pentateuch and other Studies*. trans A. P. Thomas. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I: Die Sammelnden und Bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Deuteronomistic History*. trans J. A. Clines et al., JSOTSup 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Chronicler’s History*. trans. H. G. M. Williamson, JSOTSup 50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Oswalt, John N. “מִשְׁחָה,” *NIDOTTE* II: 1123-1127.
- Payne, J. Barton. “The Validity of the Numbers in Chronicles,” *BSac* 136 (1979): 206-220.
- Paul, Shalom M. *Amos, Hermeneia*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991.
- Perdue, Leo G., Blenkinsopp Joseph, Collins John J., Meyers, Carol. *Families in Ancient Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Peterson, David. “Eschatology (OT),” *ABD* II: 575-579.
- Pietersma, Albert and Wright, Benjamin G. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Plöger, O. *Theocracy and Eschatology*. trans. S. Rudman. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Polzin, Robert. *Late Biblical Hebrew Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, HSM 12. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*, SBLEJL 7 Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Preuss, H. D. “עֹלָם,” *TDOT* X: 530-545.
- Prussner, Frederick C. “The Covenant of David and the Problem of Unity in Old Testament Theology,” *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship*. ed. Rylaarsdam, Coert. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968, 17-41.
- Rad, G. von. *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Munich: Kaiser Verlag, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Levitical Sermon in 1 and II Chronicles,” *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966, 267-280.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Theology I*. trans. D. M. G. Stalker. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Rahlf, Alfred, *Septuaginta*. revised ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Reimer, D. and Barton, John. *After the Exile*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1996.
- Rezetko, Robert. *Source and Revision in the Narratives of David’s Transfer of the Ark*, LHBOTS 470. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Ribera-Florit, Josep, “Hagiographa, Targums to,” *Encyclopedia of Midrash I*. eds. Jacob Neunsner and Alan J Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill, 2005, 148-173.
- Riley, W. *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, JSOTSup 160. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Romerowski, Sylvain. “L’esperance Messianique Dans Les Chroniques,” *HOKHMA* 34 (1987): 37-63.
- Rooke, Deborah W. *Zadok’s Heirs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Rooker, Mark F. “עֲזָרָה,” *NIDOTT* III: 379-380.
- Rothstein, J. W. and Hänel, J. *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, KAT. Leipzig: Deichertsche, 1927.
- Rudolph, W. *Chronikbücher*, HAT. Tübingen: Mohr, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_ “Problems of the Books of Chronicles,” *VT* 4 (1954): 401- 409.
- Saebø, Magne. “Messianism in Chronicles?,” *HBT* 2 (1980): 85-109.
- Sakenfeld, Katharine Doob. *The Meaning of HESED in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1978.
- Satterthwaite, Philip E., Hess, Richard S., Wenham, Gordon J. *The Lord’s Anointed*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995.
- Schenker, Adrian. “Die Verheissung Natans in 2 Sam 7 in der Septuaginta,” Paper presented in Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense LIII, 2004.
- Schniedewind, William M. “King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 71-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Society and the Promise to David*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Schultz, Richard. “Servant, Slave,” *NIDIOTT* IV: 1183-1198.
- Schumacher, J. N. “The Chronicler’s Theology of History,” *The Theologian* 13 (1957): 11-21.
- Schweitzer, Steven. *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*, LHBOTS 442. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Seebass, H. “בְּחֵרָה,” *TDOT* II: 73-87.
- Selman, Martin J. *1 Chronicles*. Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_ “The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament,” *TynBul* 40 (1989): 161-183.
- \_\_\_\_\_ “נֶגֶד,” *NIDOTTE* III: 159-160.
- Shipp, R. Mark. ““Remember His Covenant Forever”: A Study of the Chronicler’s Use of the Psalms,” *Restoration Quarterly* 35 (1983): 29-39.
- Sparks, James T. *The Chronicler’s Genealogies*. Atlanta: SBL, 2008.
- Stinespring, W. F. “Eschatology in Chronicles,” *JBL* 80 (1961): 209-219.

Stolz, F. "SEA," *DDD*: 737-742.

Strange, John. "Joram, King of Israel and Judah," *VT* 25 (1975): 191-201.

Thompson, J. A. *1, 2 Chronicles*, NAC. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.

Throntveit, M. A. *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles*, SBLDS 93. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_ "The Idealization of Solomon as the Glorification of God in the Chronicler's Royal Speeches and Royal Prayers," *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the turn of the millennium*. ed. Lowell K Handy. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 410-426.

Tomasino, Anthony. עֹלָם," *NIDOTTE* III: 345-351.

Torrey, Charles C. *Ezra Studies*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910.

Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Trebolle Barrera, Julio. "A preliminary Edition of 4QKings (4Q54)," *The Madrid Qumran Congress I*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

Trumbull, H. C. *The Covenant of Salt*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Tsevat, Matitiah. "Studies in the Book of Samuel," *HUCA* 34 (1963): 71-82.

\_\_\_\_\_ "The House of David in Nathan's Prophecy," *Bib* 46 (1965): 353-356.

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Meaning of the Book of Job and Other Biblical Studies*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1980.

Ulrich, E., Cross, F. M., Crawford, S. W., Duncan, J. A., Skehan P. W. Tov, E., Treballe Barrera, J. *Qumran Cave 4. IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, DJD XIV. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Van den Bussche, H. "Le texte de la prophétie de Nathan sur la dynastie davidique (2 Sam 7 – 1 Chr 17)," *ETL* 24 (1948): 355-394.

Vanderhooft, David. "Dwelling Beneath the Sacred Place: A Proposal for Reading 2 Samuel 7:10," *JBL* 118 (1999): 625-633.

Waltke, Bruce K. "The Phenomenon of Conditionality within Unconditional Covenants," *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration*. ed. Avraham Gileadi. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988, 123-139.

\_\_\_\_\_ *Micah*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988.

- Waltke, Bruce K. and O'Connor M. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Walvoord, John F. "The Kingdom Promises to David," *BSac* 110 (1953): 97-110.
- Weinfeld, M. "The Covenant of Grant in Old Testament and Ancient Near East," *JAOS* 90 (1970): 184-203.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "בְּרִית," *TDOT* II: 253-279.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "B<sup>e</sup>rit – Covenant vs. Obligation," *Bib* 56 (1975): 120-128.
- Weiser, Artur. "Die Legitimation des Königs David," *VT* 16 (1966): 325-354.
- Welch, Adam A. *Post-Exilic Judaism*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Work of the Chronicler*. London: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- Wellhausen, J. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Wenham, J. W. "Large Numbers in the Old Testament," *TynBul* 18 (1967): 19-53.
- Williamson, H. G. M. "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles," *VT* 26 (1976): 351-361.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_ " 'The Sure Mercies of David': Subjective or Objective Genitive?," *JSS* 23 (1978): 31-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "Eschatology in Chronicles," *TynBul* 28 (1979): 115-154.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Dynastic Oracle in the Books of Chronicles," *Isaac Leo Seeligmann Volume*. ed. Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch. Jerusalem: E Rubinstein's Publishing House, 1983, 305-318.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Ezra, Nehemiah*, WBC. Waco: Word Books, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_ "The Temple in the Books of Chronicles," *Templum Amicitiae*, JSNTSup. 48. ed. William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991, 15-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38.

Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Wilson, Gerald H. “בִּיָּת,” *NIDOTTE* I: 655-656.

Wilson, R. R. *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*. New Haven: Yale university Press, 1977.

Wright, John Wesley. “The Origin and Function of 1 Chronicles 23-27,” Ph. D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1989.

Zimmerli, Walther. *Man and His Hope in the Old Testament*. London: SCM, 1971.